34491

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada | CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* KEITH P STERLING

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* PERCEPTIONS OF ALBERTA SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* MASTER OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1977

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* DR. A.G. KONRAD

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* OCT 12/77 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Keith P Sterling

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 102 - SPATINOW DR
WETASKIWIN, ALBERTA
T9A 1W2.

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERCEPTIONS OF ALBERTA SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

by

© KEITH PHILIP STERLING

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Perceptions of Alberta Superintendents and Principals of Principal Evaluation" submitted by Keith Philip Sterling in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

A. Konrad
.....
Supervisor

.....

.....

Date..... Sept. 30, 1977.

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine the perceptions of principals and superintendents of existing and preferred criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

To collect the data, a questionnaire designed by the researcher, was mailed to all superintendents and 100 full-time principals in Alberta. The instrument consisted of four parts: Part One requested eight demographic variables; Part Two contained 36 criteria representative of three criterion classifications (presage, process, and product); Part Three listed nine possible evaluators; and Part Four outlined four possible purposes for evaluation.

Statistical procedures used to analyze the data included frequency counts and t-scores. The frequency count was utilized to describe the demographic variables; existing and preferred criteria; existing and preferred evaluators; and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation. The t-score was used to determine differences between existing and preferred responses for the principals and the superintendents, as well as the differences between the principals and superintendents regarding existing and preferred criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

Analysis of the data revealed that there was a common body of criteria that was given importance and that should be given importance in principal evaluation. When the responses of the superintendents and the principals for each

criteria classification were compared, there was no difference in the perceptions of the superintendents and the principals for existing criteria, but the superintendents preferred more importance be given to process criteria.

The results indicated that the central office staff were perceived as the existing evaluators of the principals. There was little evidence that the other evaluators were or should be involved in principal evaluation. For preferred evaluators, the results indicated that the superintendents were in agreement that they should be the evaluators, whereas the principals were in agreement that they should be the evaluators. There was no indication that other personnel were preferred as evaluators of the principals. This finding was particularly true for assessment teams consisting of lay persons from the community.

Both parties perceived that the existing and preferred purpose for evaluation was for the improvement of administrative performance.

It was concluded from the results, both parties perceived there were common criteria which are and should be used for principal evaluation, a common purpose for evaluation which is and which should be to improve administrative performance, and either the principal or the personnel from the central office are and should be the evaluators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his thanks to Dr. A.G. Konrad for his invaluable counsel, guidance and encouragement in the preparation of this thesis. The assistance of Dr. E.J. Ingram and Dr. H.W. Zingle are also gratefully acknowledged.

Thanks is extended to the superintendents and the principals of Alberta who cooperated in making this study possible.

Acknowledgement is also given to those who acted on the panel of experts and the members of the graduate seminar who assisted in the formation of the instrument.

The work of Mrs. C. Prokoff who assisted in analyzing the data of this study is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, the author wishes to acknowledge his wife Vivian, daughter Camille, and son Jason for their consideration during the preparation of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.	THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Significance of Study	4
	Delimitations	5
	Limitations	5
	Definition of Terms	6
	Organization of Thesis	8
2.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	10
	Introduction	10
	Evaluation	11
	Models For Evaluation	13
	Purposes For Evaluation	14
	Pressures to Evaluate	15
	Reluctance to Evaluate	17
	The Principalship	19
	Functions of the Principal	20
	Processes of Administration	21
	Tasks of Administration	23
	Skills in the Principalship	23
	Criteria	25
	Evaluators	28
	Evaluation Procedures	30

CHAPTER PAGE

Management-by-Objectives 31
Job Targets 31
Self-evaluation 31
Checklists 32
Descriptive Essay 32
Review of Research 33
Chapter Summary 38
3. RESEARCH DESIGN 40
Instrumentation 40
Sources of Questionnaire Items 40
Development of Criteria 42
Questionnaire Format 43
The Sample 44
Superintendents 44
Principals 45
Data Collection 45
Treatment of the Data 46
Chapter Summary 47
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA 49
Introduction 49
Description of the Sample 50
Principal Perceptions of Criteria, Evaluators, And Purposes for Evaluation 53
Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Criteria 55
Principals' Perceptions of Evaluators 62
Principals' Perceptions of Purposes For Evaluation 65

CHAPTER PAGE

Superintendents' Perceptions of Criteria, Evaluators, and Purposes for Evaluation 67

Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Criteria 68

Superintendents' Perceptions of Evaluators 75

Superintendents' Perceptions of Purposes for Evaluation 77

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Criteria, Evaluators, and Purposes for Evaluation 80

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Criteria 80

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Evaluators 87

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes for Evaluation 89

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Criteria, Evaluators, and Purposes for Evaluation 90

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Criteria 90

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Evaluators 98

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes For Evaluation 100

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Critria, Evaluators, And Purposes for Evaluation 102

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Criteria 102

CHAPTER PAGE

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Evaluators 108

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Purposes for Evaluation 111

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Criteria, Evaluators, and Purposes for Evaluation 113

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Criteria 113

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Evaluators 120

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Purposes for Evaluation 122

Chapter Summary 122

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS 125

Summary of the Study 125

Conclusions 130

Implications 132

Recommendations for Further Research 133

BIBLIOGRAPHY 135

APPENDIX 141

Appendix A: Letters to Respondents 141

Appendix B: Principal Evaluation Questionnaire 144

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
3-1	Questionnaire Returns	46
4-1	Distribution of Respondents by Location	50
4-2	Distribution of Respondents by Sex	51
4-3	Distribution of Respondents by Age and Experience	52
4-4	Distribution of Respondents by Education	53
4-5	Distribution of Principals by Size of Staff And Type of School	54
4-6	Percentage of the Principal Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Presage Criteria	56
4-7	Percentage of the Principal Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Process Criteria	58
4-8	Percentage of the Principal Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Product Criteria	61
4-9	Percentage of Principal Responses Agreeing to Existing and Preferred Evaluators	64
4-10	Percentage of Principal Responses Agreeing to Existing And Preferred Purposes for Evaluation	66
4-11	Percentage of the Superintendent Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Presage Criteria	69
4-12	Percentage of the Superintendent Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Process Criteria	71
4-13	Percentage of the Superintendent Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Product Criteria	74

Table		Page
4-14	Percentage of Superintendent Responses Agreeing to Existing and Preferred Evaluators	76
4-15	Percentage of Superintendent Responses Agreeing to Existing And Preferred Purposes for Evaluation	79
4-16	Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Presage Criteria	81
4-17	Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Process Criteria	83
4-18	Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Product Criteria	85
4-19	Comparision of Principals' Perception of Averaged Criteria	87
4-20	Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Evaluators	88
4-21	Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes for Evaluation	91
4-22	Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Presage Criteria	93
4-23	Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Process Criteria	95
4-24	Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Product Criteria	96
4-25	Comparision of Superintendents' Perceptions of Averaged Criteria	98
4-26	Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Evaluators	99
4-27	Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes for Evaluation	101
4-28	Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Presage Criteria	103

Table Page

4-29 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Process Criteria 105

4-30 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Product Criteria 107

4-31 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Averaged Existing Criteria 109

4-32 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Evaluators 110

4-33 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Purposes for Evaluation 112

4-34 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Presage Criteria 114

4-35 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Process Criteria 115

4-36 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Product Criteria 117

4-37 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Averaged Preferred Criteria 119

4-38 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Evaluators 121

4-39 Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Purposes for Evaluation 123

Chapter 1

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

Howsam (1973) stated that because man is a valuing animal, continually making assessments, the question is not whether there will be evaluation, but rather: what will be evaluated; by whom; and for what purpose?

It was noted by Krasno (1972), that a strong interest in the evaluation of educational personnel was sparked by the scientific management movement inspired by Frederick Winslow Taylor early in the 1900's. This movement, which called for the best product at the lowest cost, met with opposition from professional organizations on the basis that the criteria used for evaluation did not necessarily measure what they intended to measure.

In support of Krasno (1972), Howsam (1973), Nickolson (1972), and Pharis (1973), noted that from the curtailment of scientific management, in the 1930's, until the 1960's, evaluation in education tended to be informal and, for the most part, superficial. The evaluation of the principal was generally conducted in an informal manner by those who had an interest in or who had contact with the principal. Generally speaking, this evaluation was conducted by parents, students, teachers, custodians, school board members, superintendents, and members of other interested

publics.

In the early 1970's, Gallup (1970) noted that more concern began to be expressed by the public regarding what went on in the schools. In addition, a desire was being expressed to hold teachers and administrators more accountable for the progress of students. Gallup (1970) concluded that this agitation for accountability to the public has resulted in a movement toward formal evaluation of administrators.

Poliakoff (1973) reported that by 1971 nine states in the United States had passed legislation that called for formal evaluation of principals. In addition, three other States were in the process of preparing legislation to establish formal evaluation programs. Schramm (1976) determined that the extent of utilization of formal evaluation had more than doubled between the years of 1971 and 1975.

In Canada, the results of an informal national survey conducted by Ratsoy et. al. (1976) indicated that 25% of the school districts responding had formal evaluation procedures and that 59% followed informal evaluation procedures, with the remainder reporting no assessment procedures. Of those reporting informal procedures, approximately half were considering the implementation of formal evaluation procedures.

With the continuing pressure for accountability, plus widespread financial constraints and voices of criticism

from interest groups, it appears reasonable to assume that the demand for formal evaluation of principals will increase in the future.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of Alberta superintendents and principals regarding the evaluation of principals.

Specifically, the study was concerned with the following questions:

1. What were the principals' perception of: (a) the importance given and the importance that should be given to selected criteria; (b) the extent to which specific evaluators are involved and should be involved in principal evaluation; and (c) the purposes for which principals are evaluated and should be evaluated?

2. What were the superintendents' perception of: (a) the importance given and the importance that should be given to selected criteria; (b) the extent to which specific evaluators are involved and should be involved in principal evaluation; and (c) the purposes for which principals are evaluated and should be evaluated?

3. What is the difference between the principals' perceptions of: (a) the importance given and the importance that should be given to criteria; (b) the extent to which evaluators are involved and should be involved in principal evaluation; and (c) the purposes for which principals are

evaluated and should be evaluated?

4. What is the difference between the superintendents' perceptions of: (a) the importance given and the importance that should be given to criteria; (b) the extent to which evaluators are involved and should be involved in principal evaluation; and (c) the purposes for which principals are evaluated and should be evaluated?

5. What is the difference between the principals' perceptions and the superintendents' perceptions of: (a) the importance given to criteria; (b) the extent to which evaluators are involved in principal evaluation; and (c) the purposes for which principals are evaluated?

6. What is the difference between the principals' perceptions and the superintendents' perceptions of: (a) the importance that should be given to criteria; (b) the extent to which evaluators should be involved in principal evaluation; and (c) the purposes for which principals should be evaluated?

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

This study has merit in that it includes identification of: (a) acceptable criteria that may be used to evaluate principals; (b) acceptable evaluators of principals; and (c) acceptable purposes for evaluation that are considered important by superintendents and a sample of full-time principals in the province of Alberta.

Finally, this study will make a contribution to the

scant but growing list of Canadian works related to the formal evaluation of principals.

DELIMITATIONS

This study is delimited to the responses of superintendents and a sample of full-time principals in the province of Alberta. Furthermore, the study is delimited to the research design and instrumentation that will be discussed later.

LIMITATIONS

One limitation of this study is the 36 items selected as criteria for the evaluation of principals. Although great care was exercised in the selection of criteria, it is recognized that this list is by no means inclusive of all suitable criteria.

Another limitation of this study is the problems involved with perceptions. As Enns (1966:23) stated:

> Perceptions are not simple accurate reproductions of objective reality. Rather they are usually distorted, colored, incomplete and highly subjective versions of reality.

In this study, the perceptual limitation applies to the perceptions of principals and superintendents toward criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

It is recognized that the utilization of a panel of experts to select appropriate criteria is a limitation. The use of a questionnaire for the collection of the data is

acknowledged as a final limitation.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

To add clarity to this study, the following terms must be operationally defined.

Evaluation

The result of an appraisal or rating or measurement or ranking of principal effectiveness is defined as principal evaluation.

Purpose for Evaluation

Evaluation may be considered to be conducted for a number of purposes. Some of the possible purposes that may be considered would be to provide a measure of personal success, to initiate disciplinary action, to encourage improvement of performance, or to provide information for making decisions related to promotion.

Evaluators

For the purpose of this study, evaluators are defined as those individuals or assessment teams who make judgments of the principals with respect to one of the purposes of evaluation.

Principals

The principal is the individual in the school who is assigned to supervise personnel and perform other administrative duties on a full-time basis.

Superintendent

The superintendent is defined as the individual who is employed by the school jurisdiction as the executive officer of that jurisdiction.

Urban

Urban refers to school jurisdictions located in Calgary or Edmonton.

Rural

Rural refers to all Alberta school jurisdictions not located in Calgary or Edmonton.

Criteria

In this study, criteria refers to any set of observations that may be used as standards for evaluative purposes. Mitzel (1960) identified three types of criteria, as listed below.

Presage Criteria

Mitzel (1960) defined presage criteria as a classification of criteria that relate to personality, appearance, training, and intelligence. These are often referred to as pseudo-criteria, for their relevance depends upon assumed or conjectured relationships to either process or product criteria.

Process Criteria

Mitzel (1960) defined process criteria as a classification of criteria that relate to those aspects of behavior considered to indicate competence. In school administration, these criteria refer to administrative methods, techniques and strategies, authority relationships, and school situations.

Product Criteria

The third classification defined by Mitzel (1960) refers to criteria that relate to those aspects of growth or change in attitude and behavior that can be attributed to the impact of the person under evaluation.

ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

Chapter 1 has provided a brief introduction to the research problem and a number of sub-problems, and has identified the significance of the study, delimitations, limitations, and the definitions of the major terms used in this study. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature related to the study; this review includes the theoretical literature and previous research in this area. Chapter 3 examines the research design, including instrumentation, description of the respondents, methodgy of data collection, and finally, statistical techniques utilized. Chapter 4 is concerned with the analysis of data with respect to criteria, purposes for evaluation, and

evaluators. In Chapter 5 a summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research are presented.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

In this literature review, some of the complexities of evaluation are presented. Contained in this presentation is a brief discussion of the relationship between the values of man and human judgment. The discussion includes an examination of some evaluation models and the purposes of evaluation. The pressures for evaluation, as well as a feeling of reluctance to become involved in evaluation, are also given consideration.

The principalship is examined from the following perspectives: functions, processes, tasks, and skills. These perspectives provide the basis for the discussion of the development of criteria for evaluation. Included in this discussion are the three classifications of criteria proposed by Mitzel (1960).

Following the discussion of criteria, possible evaluators who may be suitable for principal evaluation are presented. Purposes for evaluation and a brief consideration of accepted methods of assessment are also considered. The chapter concludes with a review of research related to principal evaluation.

EVALUATION

Kellogg (1965) stated that the essence of evaluation in the human and social sciences is that one human being makes a judgment about certain aspects of another human being according to some predetermined standard for some particular purpose. Since this evaluation is based on value judgments, since each individual tends to perceive things uniquely, and since each individual has different values, it becomes very difficult to make an assessment that will be consistent with other evaluations. Evaluation in the human and social sciences tends to be subjective and based upon incomplete information. As a result, Kellogg (1965) concluded, absolute evaluation in the human and social sciences is not possible.

Redfren (1976) pointed out that the main difficulty with evaluation in the human and social sciences is that the evaluation is based on value judgments. Due to a proliferation of conflicting expectations and varying values, the task of evaluation becomes exceedingly complex, if not impossible to fulfill.

According to Gephart (n.d.), different writers in attempting to explain the complexities of evaluation, developed various models. Gephart viewed the models developed to date as being located on a continuum. At one end of the continuum, evaluation equals measurement. In this case, evaluation is viewed as an act of measurement that may or may not contribute information helpful in arriving at a

specific decision. An example of this would be the quantitative labelling of a student's work as "excellent," "good," "poor," or "bad." In such an evaluation, one of the labels is chosen as an appropriate description of the work accomplished by the student.

Gephart (n.d.) noted that at the other end of the continuum, evaluation becomes an indistinguishable part of the choice-making activity. In this case, the activities are examined by someone who is not aware of the purposes that the program were designed to accomplish. The evaluator is free to examine what he wishes to examine and comes to conclusions about the worth or value of the work that has been accomplished. An example of this approach is the technique of some accreditation agencies which examine the final outcome of the educational process. The models of evaluation that follow this pattern have the evaluation process and the decision or judgment process so interwoven that the two appear to be the same.

Between the two above mentioned ends of the continuum Gephart (n.d.) regarded evaluation as a service to the decision-making process. In this instance, the purpose of the evaluation is to serve a specific decision. It is in this area that most of the models relating to evaluation in education are found.

The possibility that evaluation can be utilized for measurement, decision-making, or judgment raises a concern. As Gephart (n.d.:12) stated, "If the parties involved have

different perceptions of the evaluation process, difficulties and disappointments can be expected." In short, if the evaluator believes and works within the framework that evaluation is measurement, and the client believes in the framework that evaluation is a judgment, then there is bound to be disagreement at some point in the evaluation process.

Models For Evaluation

Stufflebeam (1971) suggested that evaluation involves four basic activities: decision-making, input evaluation, process evaluation, and final decision. Decision-making, the first activity, relates to the choice between goals. The second activity, input evaluation, judges the relative worth of existing plans or strategies for accomplishing a chosen goal. The strategy for assisting with the operational decisions as the project is carried out, known as process evaluation, is the third activity. The fourth activity, or the final decision, is addressed to the question, "What is to be done in the next operational cycle?"

The "Countenance Model", proposed by Stake (1967), concentrates on antecedents, transactions, and outcomes. In this model, the antecedents, transactions, and outcomes are examined from four vantage points: intentions, observations, standards, and judgments. The resulting three by four matrix gives a framework for the examination of evaluation results to aid further decision-making.

A model suggested by Provus (1971), sometimes known as a discrepancy model, recognizes two basic entities: standards, or the things valued and expected, and the actual performance obtained. The discrepancy considered is the comparison of the actual performance with the standards. This comparison provides information about three alternative actions: (a) a decision to change performance in some manner; (b) a decision to change the standards; or (c) the decision to terminate the project.

For each of the previously outlined models, Gephart (n.d.) concluded that the evaluation process was aimed basically at providing information that can be utilized as a service to the decision-making process.

Purposes For Evaluation

Although evaluation in the human and social sciences has its difficulties, and there are different perceptions of how the evaluative process functions, Glass (1975) felt that this was not sufficient excuse to abandon all evaluation. Evaluation, even with its weaknesses and conflicts due to varying perspectives, does serve a purpose.

Carvel (1972) noted that evaluation functions to provide a purpose for growth. Man tends to evaluate his surroundings so that he may select, from alternatives available, a path that will best satisfy the pursuit of his objectives. By making judgments about one's position relative to certain objectives, it is possible to improve

one's position. As one realizes his position in relation to his surroundings, it is then possible to recognize personnel success, or to use this information for the purpose of planning ways to correct detected weaknesses.

Another important consideration regarding evaluation, suggested by Beall (1972), is that when one realizes his successes, he experiences a stimulating effect. This stimulation also has an effect on others by leaving them inspired and, probably, better prepared to follow.

Beall (1972) suggested that evaluation tends to improve the performance of the person who is evaluated. He also suggested that a man's morale is highest when he is working for more than survival. In other words, this leads to a sense of personal growth which in turn leads to productivity. Beall concluded that this growth and productivity should lead to improvement in the educational program.

The purposes for evaluation may be as numerous as those who propose to evaluate the principal. Some of the purposes noted included: a measure of personal success (Wickert, 1967); basis for disciplinary measures (Dolan, 1973); improvement of performance (Carvel, 1972); and appraisal for promotion to an open position (Pharis, 1973).

Pressures to Evaluate

Howsam (1973) noted that evaluation is not new to teachers and principals. Both tend to view evaluation as an

integral and natural part of the educational process. For example, students are continually being evaluated as to their progress in their programs. Educators, too, tend to desire knowledge of how well they have progressed in their work. From this Howsam (1973) suggested that educators created their own pressures to be evaluated.

Originally, according to Rentsch (1976), "accountability" referred to fiscal responsibility. With the passage of time, the term has become expanded to include student achievment, curricular programming, and teacher and administrative performance. As the costs of education rise, economic conditions remain tight, student insistence upon relevant programs grows, the total school and its program is under increased surveillance or is being asked to be more accountable.

Rentsch (1976) suggested that the increased sensitivity to economic concerns, resulted in more demand for cost effectiveness, greater student achievment, and increased productivity. With the principal as a central figure, considered by some to be the leader of the school, Rentsch (1976) argued that the principal should be held accountable for the quantity and quality of teaching and learning in his school. Rentsch (1976) further suggested that one in such a pivotal position as the principal is in should be considered a prime target for the evaluation of his performance by others. In concurrence, Gaslin (1974) and Landers (1974) pointed out that the position of the principal is in

movement away from one of power to one of leadership. This move makes the principal more visible, and hence he is pinpointed as the person responsible for the success or failure of the school. Gaslin (1974) and Landers (1974) suggested that this visibility makes the evaluation of the principal a necessary part of the education process.

Nicholson (1972) proposed a concluding pressure for principal evaluation as originating from the teachers. Since the teachers have been subjected to formal education, they are, as part of their negotiations with their employers, calling for formal evaluation of principals.

Reluctance to Evaluate

Glass (1975) proposed that when one evaluates oneself or is evaluated by others, there is a real threat that areas of weakness will be revealed. The nature of man being what it is, he does not wish to reveal his weaknesses to himself, let alone to others. This fear of knowing ourselves results in the building of defence mechanisms within ourselves. One of these takes the form of fear. Fear can confound our thoughts and our actions, and hence can distort reality.

Expanding on the fear of evaluation, Glass (1975) drew an analogy between the neurotic coping with the threat of reality and the organization coping with the threat of evaluation. In the case of the organization, huge resources of time and money are consumed by assuming defense posturing and by play-acting for the accreditation team. As the

neurotic's energies are expended in maintaining his defense for his artificial world, so that there is little energy left for living in the real world, so, too, is the organization hampered in that it has little energy left for the real world when gripped with evaluation anxiety.

In addition to the fear of knowing ourselves and the threat of revealing our weaknesses to others, Howsam (1973) felt that there are other reasons for reluctance to become involved in evaluation. One of these is that there is a tendency to mix data with judgment. Often, this judgment involved tends to be punitive. If the mind perceives evaluation as punitive, then the capacity to receive feedback that can redirect behavior is inhibited.

As previously mentioned, the conflicting expectations held by citizens, parents, students, teachers, central office supervisors, and board members make principal evaluation exceedingly complex, if not impossible to fulfill. According to Redfern (1976), professional educators hold the conviction that the educational process is extremely complex and is affected by variables that are beyond the control of the teacher, administrator, or supervisor. With the proliferation of uncontrollable variables, there is a fear that an insufficient number of variables will be taken into account when performance is evaluated.

Another concern, discussed by Carvel (1972), related to the amount of time and energy required to establish an

evaluation program within the context of the present evaluation procedures. Examination of various proposals for evaluation revealed that considerable time and energy must be expended. This consumption of time and energy, with questionable results, tends to make principals reluctant to participate in an evaluation program.

In conclusion, concern was expressed that principal evaluation should not be allowed to succumb to the pitfalls encountered during teacher evaluation. As Carvel (1972:32) aptly stated:

> Teacher evaluation has been prostituted until it neither improves instruction nor eliminates the incompetent. What it did with a high degree of success was harass both the evaluator and evaluatee into a mutual state of distrust. We can no longer afford to allow administrative evaluation to succumb to this trap.

THE PRINCIPALSHIP

In this section the principalship is examined from four possible perspectives of administration: functions, processes, tasks, and skills.

The principal, as perceived by Enns (1967), is in a position with certain assigned responsibilities and is seen as a facilitator. His duties are visualized as enabling others to do their jobs. The resulting organization, coordination, facilitation, and control that allow others to do their jobs is known as administration.

The work of this position is seen by Miklos (1975) as an integral part of school activity, and not as something

imposed as an unnecessary addition to this activity. In short, the principalship may also be stated as:

> . . . that phenomenon which coordinates the independent activities in achieving a common goal -- the education of children (Hack, 1965:5).

Functions of the Principal

Enns (1963), in examining the principal as an administrator, pointed out that the principal has five basic functions: staffing, motivating and stimulating, consultation, program development, and evaluation.

In the staffing function, the principal directs his concerns at "recruitment, selection, orientation, and placement of teachers as well as developing attractive conditions for employment and retention" (Enns, 1963:28).

The function of motivation and stimulation is extremely complex. Just what activities motivate or stimulate are uncertain. They may be the result of the removal of negative factors from the job environment, or they may be the result of the addition of positive factors to the job environment. They may also be the result of any combination of positive or negative factors.

A third function of the principal is consultation with teachers in order that they may maintain their professional knowledge and competence. He may also aid them to reach a level of acceptability, and then assist them in maintaining that level.

As the school's program is the key to instruction and

learning, the principal has a function in program development. There appears to be a relationship between the adequacy of the program and the attainment of instructional goals.

The final function as proposed by Enns (1963) is evaluation, and it may be used to achieve other functions, or it may be an integral part of the other functions. Although evaluation is complex, it is a function of administration.

Processes of Administration

Another perspective to examine when considering the principalship is the processes of administration. There have been many attempts by various scholars to describe the processes of administration. Miklos (1975), after reviewing the processes of administration as proposed by several different writers, selected Gregg's (1957) proposal that the processes of administration consist of seven components: planning, decision-making, organizing, coordinating, communicating, influencing, and evaluating.

According to Miklos (1975), who placed the identified processes of administration in a sequence, one of the first considerations in any organization is planning. This is the process in which the objectives are identified, alternatives are laid out, and procedures are planned so that the objectives may be attained.

After the establishment of objectives and alternatives,

there is the process of decision-making by the principal. In short, "He either makes decisions, creates structures and conditions for making decisions, or controls the decision-making process in an organization" (Miklos, 1975:5).

With respect to the third process, organizing, there are two types: long-term organizing, in the form of more or less permanent design, and day-to-day organizing. In both types, "organizing has to be an on-going, a continuous activity" (Miklos, 1975:6).

The fourth process is that of coordinating, or maintaining a desired relationship amongst the various responsibilities of the principalship. This process also makes resources available in the right place at the right time.

Information and decisions must be conveyed to appropriate locations within the organization. What is going on within the organization must be known by various people in sundry positions. This process of communication is another important component of administration.

Still another process is influencing. The principal must be able to influence teachers and students if there is to be organization and coordination. Not only must the principal be able to influence teachers and students, he must also be able to exert influence at higher levels if the school is to receive the resources and support it requires.

The final component of the administrative process, as examined by Miklos (1975), is evaluation. Similar to the

description of evaluation as a function, evaluation as a process may be the final component or it may be actually inter-related with other process components.

Tasks of Administration

There are many writers who have focused attention on the tasks of administration and each writer tends to give different importance to different tasks. This is due in part to each writer viewing tasks differently, depending upon his objectives or his past experience. As Miklos (1975:9) aptly stated:

> As is the case for defining components of the administrative process, different writers find it useful to present different categorizaticns of the task areas in educational administration and to define them with varying degrees of specificity.

The task areas suggested by Campbell (1971) tend to summarize much of the writing in this area. Campbell (1971) considered the task areas of administration to be: school program, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school-community relations, physical facilities, and school management. For each of these task areas, one can identify several specific tasks that may be considered important in the principalship. Further consideration of the tasks of administration will be presented when the criteria for evaluation are discussed.

Skills in the Principalship

A final perspective to be considered is the skills that are a necessary part of the principalship. Downey (1961), in considering the skills of an effective principal, identified

four groups of skills: the technical-managerial, the human-managerial, the technical-educational, and the speculative-creative.

The technical-managerial skills are those skills required for the efficient operation of a school office which do not involve the human aspects of management.

Similar to the processes of administration discussed earlier, the principal must have or acquire skills which will influence and stimulate others. Included in these are the skills that will enable the principal to draw as much as possible from his staff. These are known as the human-managerial skills.

The skills that relate to what one would consider as a measure of competence in the field of education are known as the technical-educational skills. In this case, the individual possesses the skills that will enable him to apply educational technologies to achieve the goals set in his sphere of education.

The final group of skills considered by Downey are the speculative-creative skills. These skills are generally connected with a man of vision. According to Downey(1961), some of the time and energy of the principal should be devoted to the serious contemplation of the future with the objective of trying to envision what the educational institution is likely to become.

This section reviewed some of the dimensions of the principalship, based on the perceptions of various writers.

The functions of the principal as an administrator were considered first, followed by an examination of the processes, tasks, and skills of administration.

CRITERIA

A key component that must be considered when examining evaluation is the identification of criteria. The selection of criteria constitutes a problem in evaluation because of the complexities associated with determining common tasks and skills in administration. As stated earlier this problem is accentuated by a great number of variables involved in the complex field of human behavior.

In addition to the number of variables that must be dealt with, Sause (1974) indicated that criteria must be kept flexible so that when change takes place, the new program can be measured. There is a real danger of becoming locked into a system wherein the criteria become static and appear to be a standard of a program that can easily be measured. The result of unchanging criteria is that it becomes questionable whether anything is measured.

In commenting on the problem of creating criteria, Mitzel (1960:1482) stated:

> Criteria cannot be trivial; otherwise evaluations are made against trival standards. The problems of defining a satisfactory criterion and of locating or developing adequate measures of it have not been unique to teacher effectivness research.

Stufflebeam(1971) focused attention on the selection of criteria as being invariably tied to a value system.

According to Stufflebeam, there are three types of criteria, each with particular characterisitics. These are: scientific, practical, and prudential criteria. Scientific criteria possess internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity. For practical criteria, relevance, importance, scope, credibility, and timeliness need to be included. Practical criteria are essential if the evaluative information is to be truly informative to the receiver. The final type of criteria is prudential, which involves such requirements as time, cost, and personnel. For principal evaluation, as noted by Stufflebeam (1971), the attention tends to be focused on practical criteria.

Mitzel(1960) felt that criteria should possess four basic attributes: relevance, reliability, freedom from bias, and practicality. Relevance as a criterion attribute is the product of a rational analysis of the job. The detection of relevant criteria for the evaluation of the principal, as mentioned previously, has become an almost impossible task, due to the proliferation of school goals without agreement on their priority.

Mitzel(1960) stated that an estimate of the reliability of criteria is essential. It is more important to know the level of reliability than for the level of reliability to be high. Mitzel felt that low reliabilities do not distort relationships.

Another attribute, freedom from bias, is desirable according to Mitzel (1960), even though total elimination of

bias may lower reliability. Uncontrolled biasing factors tend to lead to false results, hence the importance of a continuous effort to minimize bias in criteria.

The final attribute, practicality, is related to convenience and economy. Mitzel felt that this is probably the least essential of the four criterion attributes.

As indicated earlier, for the development of criteria suitable for evaluation of principals, one needs to examine the tasks and skills required for the principalship. Attention is now focused on these areas.

The task of school program, as stated by Miklos (1975), is sometimes considered a responsibility of the school principal. The question of how well the school is achieving the goals of the program must be considered. In relation to pupil personnel, the principal is considered to have major responsibility in accounting for and organizing pupils. The degree to which the principal knows the needs of his school could form a source of other specific criteria. Also, the principal's ability to communicate these needs may be measured. The way staff are assigned could also constitute a measurable dimension of the principalship.

Also, Miklos (1975) felt that the principal is considered responsible for developing school-community contact. How well the contacts are made and the degree to which the principal is able to communicate the school program to the community may be considered to be important. The organization, coordinating, and scheduling of space and

equipment are also measureable tasks of the principal. And finally, according to Miklos (1975), the measurement of the effectiveness of the principal in handling the tasks related to school management could form an additional source of criteria.

With respect to skills, Downey (1961) indicated that the examination of how well orders are made for supplies, the adequacy or accuracy of the timetable could be a measure for some of the technical-managerial skills. The degree to which the principal can influence his staff and students, or the human-managerial skills, could be used to generate more criteria. The level to which the principal is able to apply his technical skills could be utilized as a further source of criteria. A final skill area, the speculative-creative skills, could consititute the final source-area for criterion items.

EVALUATORS

Formal evaluation does not appear to be the responsibility of any one evaluator or team of evaluators. According to Ratsoy et. al. (1976:14):

> The literature reveals that to determine who is to be involved in the assessment program, one must take into consideration the type and purpose of the desired program.

Kellogg (1965) suggested that the superintendent and his designate have a role in the evaluation of the principal. In this sense, the superintendent has held the

superordinate position, which suggests that it would be natural for him to evaluate those in the subordinate position.

When the purpose of evaluation is for development, Bolton (1973) stated that self-assessment and team assessment would be appropriate. Bolton (1973) felt that for self-assessment it would be appropriate to have the principal be the evaluator.

Poliakoff (1973) was of the opinion that evaluation of the principal by teachers and students was not part of the trend in evaluation of administrators. Yet even though teachers and students were not part of the trend, Poliakoff felt that there was a role for them to play in the evaluation of the principal. Sanacore (1976), working on the assumption that since principals evaluate teachers it would be reasonable to have teachers evaluate principals, had teachers evaluate principals. He found success in that the evaluation helped the principals improve.

A possible team of evaluators for the evaluation of the principal was proposed by Gaslin (1974). He suggested that the assessment be performed by a third party who had no direct connection with either the administrative team or the teaching staff of the school that was to be evaluated. Gaslin suggested that the assessment team consist of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system.

Rosenberg (1973) proposed that the assessment team

consist of professional educators and lay members of the school community. He felt this type of assessment team would be particularly useful as a follow-up to self-evaluation performed by the principal.

Ratsoy et. al. (1976), in their review of possible evaluators, noted that principal evaluation could be conducted by an assessment team consisting of the superintendent, the principal, and a third person who would be acceptable to both.

The final assessment team to be considered for use in principal evaluation could be an assessment team consisting of professional educators not directly connected with the school system. In Alberta, a logical source of such evaluators could be the Regional Offices of Education.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A review of the literature would not be complete without consideration of the evaluation procedures. Attention will now be given to the major approaches presently utilized in attempting to assess the quality of administrative performance. Ratsoy et. al. (1976), in his review of evaluation procedures, noted that the major approaches included management-by-objectives, job targets, self-evaluation, checklists, and the descriptive essay. Each of these methods is outlined below.

Management-by-Objectives

Redfern (1972) indicated that the technique utilized in the management-by-objectives approach to assessment has the subordinate and the superordinate jointly identify common goals. They also determine how the goals will be attained and a means of measuring or assessing the contribution of the members attaining the goals. This approach tends to be conducive to growth and is useful in planning future activities.

Job Targets

Job targets, a form of management-by-objectives, may be thought of as a process that is cyclical (Armstrong, 1973). In this approach, job performance objectives are established, and then performance data are monitored. In due course, assessments are made and assessment conferences held. The cycle resumes with follow-up and the re-establishment of job performance objectives.

Self-evaluation

Rosenberg (1973) stated that in the use of this procedure the principal assesses his own strengths and weaknesses. The procedure this assessment follows is for the principal to assess himself using a predetermined rating scale. Using this procedure, it is then possible for the principal to assess his strengths and weaknesses or to determine his progress towards predetermined goals.

Checklists

The system of checklists, outlined by Pharis (1973), basically comprises a number of statements related to the principalship. In using the checklist, the evaluator checks statements that would rate or indicate how well the principal is performing. It is possible to use the checklist system in conjunction with other forms of assessment. There is a weakness in depending upon a checklist system in that there is a tendency for the checklist to reveal more about the evaluator than it does about the person being evaluated.

Descriptive Essay

In this assessment procedure, according to Ratsoy et. al. (1976), the evaluator writes a descriptive essay that relates to the strengths, weaknesses, or potential of the person being evaluated. This style of evaluation has a weakness in that the assessment tends to be very subjective.

It should be noted that the method of assessment should reflect the purposes of the assessment program. Whatever method is used, one must be aware of bias of the rater causing distortion, as well as the near impossibility that it will be value-free. As Ratsoy et. al. (1976:16) stated: "No assessment scheme will be totally reliable and valid." And further, a "need to involve many people in designing and implementing an assessment program, particularly those directly affected . . ." must be kept in mind when attempting to establish a suitable method of assessment.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Research has been conducted on various aspects of the principal. This review of research will cover studies related to perceptions of the role of the principal, studies that investigated Mitzels (1960) classifications of criteria, and analyses of current practice and management literature related to performance appraisal. Also included are studies related to administrators' and teachers' perceptions of administrative responsibility. Attention will be given to a study which investigated the feasibility of principal evaluation. Finally, a review of a study directed at administrators' perceptions of emphasis on selected administrative competencies will conclude this portion of the review.

Bosetti (1966) conducted a study on (a) the degree to which the principals' role expectations are congruent with the teachers' and superintendents' expectations for his role, (b) the degree of sensitivity the principals are accurate to the perceptions of the teachers and to the perceptions of the superintendents of the principals' leadership behavior, and (c) the rated effectiveness that the principal received from the teachers and from the superintendents. Bosetti's (1966) findings indicated that there were no significant relationships between the principals' sensitivity and congruence and between congruence and rated effectiveness. He found a significant

relationship between sensitivity and rated effectiveness.

From these findings, Bosetti (1966) concluded that the principal must be accurate in his perceptions of his own behavior so that these are as congruent as possible with those that he interacts with in his capacity as an administrator. He also concluded that the three dimensions of congruence, sensitivity, and rated effectiveness were functions of variables other than the principals' demographic characteristics.

In a study similar to Bosetti's, Toews (1970) investigated the differences in expectations of the elementary-junior high principal as held by superintendents, principals, and teachers. In this study, Toews examined the differences in the expectations in terms of the principal's attributes and the principal's behavior.

Toews (1970), found that the three groups differed in their expectations on items which related to the principal's school management behavior, staff-relationships behavior, and community and professional behavior. He found that there was less difference between the groups when considering the principal's attributes.

Cooper(1972) examined the perceptions of college instructors regarding the methods used to evaluate instructors, purposes for evaluation, and criteria of evaluation used to measure competence and promotion to administrative positions. Cooper found that the common methods used were student evaluation, classroom observation,

and team evaluation. The major purpose for evaluation found in her study was to improve instruction. One conclusion reached was that the criteria used for the study did represent a common body of criteria that could be used for the evaluation of instructors. The study showed that process criteria were stressed when evaluating for competence, and presage criteria when rating for administrative position. There was an indication that there was a lack of emphasis on product criteria in staff evaluation.

Volk(1972), in his examination of the perceptions of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan School District considering existing and preferred evaluative personnel and existing and preferred importance given evaluation criteria, found that there was an emphasis on process criteria. He also found that the superintendent and the principal were used extensively as evaluators of teachers. His findings indicated that there was no difference between existing and preferred evaluators. One conclusion reached was that no one person should have the sole responsibility for teacher evaluation. He found that there should be several people involved in evaluation, and that evaluations should be performed more frequently.

Fouks (1976), in his analyses of current practice and management literature for conducting performance appraisal and pay programs for school administrators, concluded that the role of the administrator has become extremely complex due to the demands for accountability, financial

constraints, the critical attitude of the public, the militant attitude of the teachers and the changing attitudes of the students. The author contended that education and experience should be factors for job entry, but how he performs and achieves objectives in the personal and organizational spheres should be determining factors in performance appraisal. Fouks (1976) indicated that the major criterion for perfcrmance appraisal should be related to job performance.

A study of the differences between administrators' and teachers' perceptions of actual and ideal priorities of responsibilities conducted by Traugott (1976) found that there were several areas of administrative responsibility in which there was significant misunderstanding or disagreement between administrators and teachers. He found that there were more frequent and consistent differences between superintendents and teachers than between principals and teachers.

In a study of formal evaluation of administrators, conducted in the six-county metropolitan Detroit area, Schramm (1976) concluded that evaluation of administrators was workable for all levels of the administrative hierarchy. The findings also revealed that formal evaluation, although not wide spread, was in effect in the study area. The nature of the evaluation systems were evenly divided between pre-determined rating forms and the job target/management-by-objectives approach. There were noteable differences between

"actual" practices and "ideal" practices related to the principal evaluation process. Schramm felt that a further development of a general model of administrative evaluation was possible.

In the development of such a model, Schramm concluded that consideration should be given to purposes of the system, processes and procedures should be consistent with the purposes, provisions should be made for the assessment of the actual results of the system and provisions should be made for the modifications of the system.

Pitts (1976), in his study of urban administrators' perceptions of emphasis placed on selected administrative competencies, found there were no significant differences in the perceptions of urban administrators placed on certain administrative competency categories and the degree of emphasis they desired to place on these categories. The categories included: (a) instruction and curriculum development, (b) staff personnel, (c) pupil personnel, (d) finance and business management, (e) school plant and services, and (f) school-community relations. Pitts concluded that: (a) all urban administrators desired to place greater emphasis on the categories of instruction and curriculum development, pupil personnel, finance and business management, school plant and services, and school community relations; (b) the greatest emphasis should be placed on the instruction and curriculum development category and the school-community relations category; and

(c) the general category of staff personnel was stressed by all administrators with little emphasis on the item "maintaining records".

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a review of some of the literature and research related to the principalship and the phenomenon of evaluation. Attention was given to models for evaluation, purposes for evaluation, pressures to evaluate, and reluctance to evaluate.

Some of the dimensions of the principalship found in the literature were then discussed. In this discussion, the functions of the principal, the processes of administration, the tasks of administration, and the skills of the principalship were outlined.

A review of Mitzel's (1960) attributes of criteria for evaluation was included in this chapter. Possible evaluators of principals were identified, followed by an examination of selected purposes for evaluation. A brief outline of the more popular evaluation procedures was provided.

The chapter concluded with a brief review of some of the related research. This review included work on the role of the principal, Mitzel's (1960) classifications of criteria, analysis of current practice and literature of performance appraisal, and studies related to perceptions of evaluation. Also included was a review of a study related to administrators' and teachers' perceptions of administrative

responsibility plus a study which investigated the possibility of principal evaluation. Concluding the review was a study directed at administrators' perceptions of emphasis on selected administrative competencies.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter contains a description of the research design used in this study. Included in this description is an outline of the procedures followed in constructing the instrument. Following a discussion of instrumentation, the characteristics of the respondents who participated in this study are presented. The procedures used in data collection are also included in this chapter. And finally, a brief description of the statistical techniques used in analyzing the data concludes the chapter.

INSTRUMENTATION

The instrument used in this study for the collection of data was a questionnaire entitled "Principal Evaluation Questionnaire" (Appendix B). This questionnaire, consisting of four parts, was developed by the researcher for this study.

Sources of Questionnaire Items

Part One of the questionnaire was designed for the purpose of collecting important demographic information from the respondents. Items considered important for this study were age, sex, experience as a full-time principal, experience as a superintendent, position, training, location, school size, and school classification. With this

information, it was then possible to draw a profile of the respondents.

Part Two of the questionnaire was designed to identify criteria suitable for the evaluation of principals. Previous research work on evaluation of instructors conducted by Cooper(1972), Moore (1966), and Volk (1972), and research on the role of the principal by Bosetti (1966) and Toews (1970), were particularly helpful. Material written by Ratsoy et. al. (1976), Beall (1972), Carvell (1972), Landers (1974), and Thomas (1974) supplemented the research findings regarding decision-making about suitable items for inclusion as criteria. The selected items for criteria were classified according to the three categories as proposed by Mitzel (1960). The development of specific criteria was discussed in detail in Chapter 2

In selecting appropriate evaluators for Part Three of the instrument, material compiled by Ratsoy et. al. (1976) and Carvell (1972) were particularly helpful. From these works, it was considered important to include individuals, groups, and teams. The superintendent, the superintendent's designate, and the principal are examples of individuals who are possible evaluators. The teaching staff and students of the school constitute groups who could act as evaluators. Finally, various combinations of professional educators, superintendents, principals, and lay persons constitute the last of the possible evaluators.

Part Four of the instrument contains four possible

purposes for evaluation, The works of Carvel (1972), Dolan (1973), Pharis (1973), and Wickert (1967) were used to select the purposes used in this study, namely: providing a measure for personal success, initiating disciplinary action, encouraging improvement, or providing information for making decisions for promotion.

Development of Criteria

To ensure that statements used in this study did represent criteria for evaluation of principals, and that the statements were properly classified according to Mitzel's categories, a panel of five experts from the Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, was asked to determine the appropriateness of each item. A majority opinion expressed by this panel was considered sufficient for the inclusion of an item in the instrument. Following the classification of the items, Part Two of the instrument was piloted for clarity and relevance in a graduate seminar in the Master's degree program in educational administration.

Initially, 49 statements were developed as possible criteria for the evaluation of principals. The first submission of these statements to the panel of experts identified ambiguities in many of the items. The feedback received from the panel on the first list of criteria was used to develop a revised list of 48 items considered appropriate for use as criteria for principal evaluation.

The new list was submitted to the same panel for their consideration and reaction.

The second submission to the panel generated feedback that was used to clarify and to classify the items considered appropriate to the study. By accepting the majority opinion of the panel, 42 items were retained for submission to the graduate seminar for consideration of clarity and relevance.

The members of the seminar were asked to react to the items and indicate the clarity and relevance of each on a five-point scale. Items that received a rating of 3.0 or greater were considered to be sufficiently relevant and clear for retention in the study. In addition to the rating procedure, items were discussed in the seminar.

Using the results from the piloting and the feedback from the panel, a final list of 36 items considered suitable as criteria for the evaluation of principals was selected. Following the final revision, the instrument was prepared for mailing to the selected sample.

Questionnaire Format

In designing the questionnaire, a number of factors were taken into account. The first major concern was to ensure that the respondents either agreed or disagreed with the importance given to criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation. This was accomplished by utilizing a four-point Likert-type scale for the responses in Part Two, Part

Three, and Part Four of the questionnaire.

The second concern was that the criteria selected for use in the instrument be representative of Mitzel's three classifications of criteria: presage, process, and product. A third concern was to reduce bias in the classifications when the respondents indicated the importance of the criteria. This concern was taken into account by arranging the criterion items in random order. A fourth concern was to be able to transfer easily the data collected from the instrument to data cards for computer processing. The final concern was to create an instrument that was attractive, short, and simple to complete.

THE SAMPLE

Superintendents

Using a list of Alberta School Jurisdictions prepared by the Field Administrative Office, Field Services Branch, Alberta Education, in September of 1976, 93 superintendents were identified as being employed by school jurisdictions in the province of Alberta.

According to the list, four superintendents were employed in urban centers, three were employed for Department of National Defense School Districts, and 15 provided services to more than one school district. The questionnaire was mailed to all identified superintendents.

Principals

A listing of principals supplied by Alberta Education, September 1976, indicated that there were 257 principals in the province who were assigned full-time to supervising personnel and performing other administrative duties. From this list, a sample of 100 principals was selected. To ensure that all principals who indicated they were full-time administrators had an equal opportunity to participate in the project, a random sampling procedure using a table of random numbers was utilized. No attempt was made to stratify the sample in terms of location, type of school, or size of school. Following the selection, it was noted that approximately the same number of principals was selected from the rural and urban areas, whereas the original list indicated that 164 of the 257, or 63.8%, had Calgary or Edmonton addresses.

DATA COLLECTION

The data were collected from the members of the sample by use of a questionnaire. In order that reminders could be sent, the questionnaires were numbered according to the names on the lists. To facilitate returns a self-addressed return envelope was enclosed with each questionnaire.

One hundred ninety-three questionnaires were mailed to the members of the sample at the end of February. By mid-March, two-thirds of the sample had returned the questionnaires. In order to improve the rate of returns, a

reminder letter was mailed to those who had not responded. On March 11, 1977, 65 reminders were mailed. The use of the reminder increased the rate of return to 88.2% for superintendents and 85% for principals. This information is presented in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1

Questionnaire Returns

Item description	Superintendents		Principals	
	f	%	f	%
Number in sample	93	100	100	100
Number of returns	82	88.2	85	85.0
Number of useable returns	77	82.8	80	80.0

Of the returned questionnaires, 10 could not be used in this study. The reasons for rejection included: a newly appointed principal did not feel competent to reply; one superintendent attempted to revise the questionnaire, hence his responses were not considered appropriate; one response from a principal was received too late to be included in the data; and seven replies were considered too incomplete to be of any value.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The information from the useable questionnaires was

transferred to data cards for processing. The data were processed by computer using SPSS programs.

A program was selected to provide percentage responses which facilitated the examination of the demographic data of the principals and the superintendents as well as the perceptions of the two groups of the importance given and the importance that should be given to selected criteria, the extent to which evaluators are involved and should be involved in principal evaluation and, finally, the purpose for which principals are evaluated and should be evaluated.

To examine the differences between principals' and superintendents' perceptions, principals' existing and preferred perceptions, and superintendents' existing and preferred perceptions of criteria, evaluators and purposes for evaluation, a program that generated t-scores was employed. The resulting scores were used to identify significant differences. Differences were regarded as being statistically significant when a probability of 0.05 or less was reached.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter included descriptions of instrumentation, persons included in the sample, data collection, and data analysis. The portion of the chapter dealing with instrumentation detailed the source of the items, the questionnaire format, and the steps used to revise the questionnaire. The the members of the sample and their

location were outlined for the reader. The procedures utilized to ensure a high rate of return were also discussed. Finally, an outline of the programs selected to analyse the data was included.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains a description of the demographic variables of the sample, followed by a detailed presentation of the perception of Alberta superintendents and principals regarding the evaluation of principals. Specifically, the chapter contains the details of the principals' and the superintendents' perceptions regarding the importance that is given and the importance that should be given to criteria, the extent to which evaluators are involved and should be involved in principal evaluation, and the responses indicating the purposes for which principals are evaluated and should be evaluated.

The comparisons of the principals' responses to existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation are included in this chapter. Also included are the comparisons of the superintendents' responses to existing and preferred evaluators and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation. The comparison of the superintendents' and the principals' responses to existing criteria, existing evaluators and existing purposes for evaluation and the comparison of the superintendents' and the principals' responses to preferred criteria, preferred

evaluators and preferred purposes for evaluation concluded this chapter.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

An examination of Table 4-1 reveals that slightly over five per cent of the superintendents and slightly over one half of the principals who responded were employed in urban centres.

Table 4-1

Distribution of Respondents by Location

Location	Superintendent		Principal	
	f	%	f	%
Urban	4	5.2	43	53.8
Rural	73	94.8	37	46.2
Total	77	100	80	100

All of the superintendents and 90% of the principals, as reported in Table 4-2, were male. Table 4-3 shows that slightly over 30% of the superintendents were under 41 years of age, whereas slightly under 40% of the principals were in the same age group.

Table 4-3 also describes the levels of experience within the two groups: slightly over 60% of the

Table 4-2
Distribution of Respondents by Sex

Sex	Superintendent		Principal	
	f	%	f	%
Male	77	100	72	90.0
Female	0	0	8	10.0
Total	77	100	80	100

superintendents had five years or less than five years of experience as a full-time principal, and a little over one third of the superintendents had five years or less than five years experience as a superintendent. More than one third of the principals had five years or less than five years experience as a full-time principal, and none of the principals had previous experience as a superintendent.

Table 4-4, which displays the formal education of the superintendents and the principals, shows that slightly over one half of the principals had at least a bachelor's degree but less than a master's degree, and that one third of the principals possessed a master's degree. The results indicated that superintendents tend to be better educated than the principals. Although slightly less than 20% of the superintendents had a bachelor's degree but less than a master's degree, over 33% of the superintendents held a master's degree and the balance had more than a master's

Table 4-3

Distribution of Respondents by Age and Experience

Item	Superintendent f	Superintendent %	Principal f	Principal %
Age				
Under 36	9	11.7	9	10.3
36 - 40	15	19.5	23	28.8
41 - 45	16	20.8	14	17.5
46 - 50	19	24.7	20	25.0
Over 50	18	23.4	14	17.6
Total	77	100.1	80	100.2
Experience as a full-time principal				
Less than 1 year	17	22.1	4	5.0
1 - 5	30	39.0	24	30.3
6 - 10	13	16.9	22	27.5
Over 10	17	22.1	30	37.6
Total	77	100.1	80	100.4
Experience as a full-time superintendent				
Less than 1 year	1	1.3	80	100
1 - 5	28	36.4	0	0
6 - 10	31	40.3	0	0
Over 10	17	22.1	0	0
Total	77	100.1	80	100

Table 4-4

Distribution of Respondents by Education

Education	Superintendent		Principal	
	f	%	f	%
Bachelor's degree(s) but less than Master's degree	15	19.5	46	57.5
Master's degree	29	37.7	27	33.8
More than Master's degree	23	29.9	5	6.3
Doctorate	10	13	2	2.5
Total	77	100.1	80	100.1

degree.

An examination of the distribution of the principals according to size of staff and classification of school revealed that one half of the principals were in schools with a staff of 11 to 30 teachers, and just over 40% of the principals were in schools that were classified as elementary or elementary-junior high (Table 4-5).

PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF CRITERIA, EVALUATORS, AND PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

One of the major purposes of this study was to reveal the principals' perceptions of existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing

Table 4-5

Distribution of Principals by Size of Staff
And Type of School

Staff and School	Distribution f	Distribution %
Size of Staff		
10 or Fewer	4	5.0
11 - 20	16	20.0
21 - 30	24	30.0
31 - 40	15	18.8
41 - 50	10	12.5
51 - 60	4	5.0
61 - 70	1	1.3
71 - 80	3	3.8
Over 80	3	3.8
Total	80	100.2
Classification of School		
Elementary School	26	32.5
Elementary-junior High School	10	12.5
Elementary-junior-Senior High School	7	8.8
Junior High School	7	8.8
Junior-senior High School	11	13.8
Senior High School	16	20.0
Other	3	3.8
Total	80	100.2

and preferred purposes for evaluation. The responses indicating agreement with the criteria as classified according to Mitzel (1960), evaluators, and purposes for evaluation will be presented in this section.

Each item of the questionnaire was scored on a four-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. For the purpose of reporting the perceptions of the principals, the percentage responses for "agree" and "strongly agree" were combined to form a single percentage. This score was used to indicate the agreement of the principals with proposed criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Criteria

First to be examined are the principals responses to each criterion classification. The responses indicating agreement with the importance given and the importance that should be given are presented in the following passages.

Presage Criteria. An examination of Table 4-6 reveals that each presage criterion was given importance in principal evaluation by at least 50% of the principals. "Mastery of educational administration studies," with 53.8% of the principals indicating agreement, was the criterion with the lowest percentage agreement. The highest rate of agreement (93.8%) with the importance given to presage criteria in principal evaluation was for "Expertise in

Table 4-6

Percentage of the Principal Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Presage Criteria
N = 80

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Capacity for contemplation of the future	56.3	91.3
Acceptability of personality	87.1	97.5
Expertise in school management	93.8	97.5
Courage to take risks	54.4	92.4
Ability to stimulate	83.5	98.8
Exactness in communication	82.6	97.6
Suitability of appearance	73.1	82.0
Capability for influencing	81.0	92.4
Mastery of educational administration studies	53.8	66.7
Skill for organizing	95.0	98.8
Training in decision making	66.7	81.8
Sensitive to when change is necessary	78.8	97.5

school management." "Skill for organizing" and "The ability to stimulate" were the criteria with the greatest number of principals (93.8%) agreeing that these should be given importance in principal evaluation. The criterion with the lowest percentage of the principals indicating it should be given importance in principal evaluation was "Mastery of educational administration studies," at 66.7%. With the exception of this criterion, all the other presage criteria received over 80% of agreement that they should be given importance in principal evaluation.

These results indicate that principals perceived that all criteria were important and should be given importance in evaluation. There was an indication that the criteria related to studies in educational administration were not perceived by a large majority of principals as being given or deserving importance in principal evaluation. Expertise in school management was perceived by most of the principals as being important in principal evaluation. Further, the results suggest that the greatest percentage of the principals indicated that presage items related to success in organizing and stimulating should be used.

Process criteria. Table 4-7 shows that the responses of the principals to process criteria received over 60% agreement that they are given importance in principal evaluation. Two exceptions to this were "Developing budget control systems," which had 58.8% agreeing, and "Regularly

Table 4-7

Percentage of the Principal Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Process Criteria
N = 80

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Interprets school program to the community	91.3	100
Organizes human and material resources	97.6	100
Reviews progress of students	78.8	89.8
Sets an example for staff to follow	86.1	93.6
Establishes communication channels deliberately	82.3	95.0
Maintains liaison with other principals	62.5	95.0
Establishes order of priority in problem solving	65.9	92.4
Regularly evaluates staff performance formally	57.6	59.5
Develops budget control systems	58.8	81.3
Involves staff in policy formation	87.5	98.8
Develops efficient methods for handling school routine	87.5	95.0

evaluates staff performance formally," which had 57.6% of the principals agreeing. The criterion with the highest percentage of the principals reporting agreement with its importance was "Organizing human and material resources," at 97.6%.

When considering the process criteria that should be given importance, all of the principals agreed that "Interprets school program to the community" and "Organizes human and material resources" should be given importance in principal evaluation. The criterion with the smallest percentage of principals agreeing that it should be given importance was "Regularly evaluates staff performance formally," with slightly under 60% in agreement. With the exception of "Developing budget control systems," with slightly over 80%, and "Reviews progress of students," with slightly under 90%, the remainder of the criteria received over 90% agreement that each item should be given importance in principal evaluation.

The principals perceived that all process criteria were and should be given importance in principal evaluation. The responses to process criteria indicated that principals do not perceive that formal evaluation of staff and development of budget controls are given great importance in evaluation. As with the responses to presage criteria, the greatest number of principals perceived that importance is given to criterion that relate to organizing.

Regarding the preferred process criteria, the responses

suggest that the largest number of principals agreed that standards related to organization and communication would form appropriate criteria for principal evaluation. There was an indication that regular, formal evaluation of staff was not supported by a large number of principals as a preferred evaluative criterion.

Product criteria. The information presented in Table 4-8 discloses the percentage of principals agreeing as to which product criteria was given and should be given importance in principal evaluation. "Techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change," with just under 55% agreement, was the criterion with the lowest percentage agreement in this classification. The remainder of the product criteria had over 65% of the principals agreeing that each was important in principal evaluation. The criterion, "School operated successfully," had just over 93% of the principals in agreement that importance was given to this standard in the evaluation of principals.

In examining the percentage responses of the principals regarding the importance that should be given to product criteria, one learns that all the principals supported the criterion, "Staff inspired to achieve goals." The remainder of the product criteria, with the exception of the criterion, "School buildings and grounds maintained," at just over 65%, had over 80% of the principals agreeing that in evaluating the principal, each should be given

Table 4-8

Percentage of the Principal Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Product Criteria
N = 80

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Staff inspired to achieve goals	92.6	100
Decisions respected by staff	87.4	94.9
Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time	66.3	82.5
Delegated duties dischared by subordinates	74.3	90.0
Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change	54.4	92.5
Staff knowledgeable of school policy	81.3	93.8
Budget funds expended according to plan	75.1	88.8
School operated successfully	93.6	96.1
Students' perfcrmance recognized	83.8	90.0
School buildings and grounds maintained	67.5	65.1

Table 4-8 (continued)

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Balance attained between innovative and proven programs	78.5	89.9
Community well informed of school programs	78.8	93.8
Routine matters disposed of effectively	82.5	95.1

importance.

The results suggest that a small majority of the principals agreed that being able to bring about change was a criterion used in principal evaluation. There was a larger number of principals who felt that this criterion should be given importance in principal evaluation. There was an indication in the responses that the principals would prefer criteria based on the ability to bring about change should be utilized. The results indicated that criteria related to inspiration of staff had the largest number of principals in support.

Principal Perceptions of Evaluators

A second component of this aspect of the study was to discover the principals' perceptions of the extent to which evaluators were involved and the extent to which evaluators

should be involved in principal evaluation.

Examination of Table 4-9 reveals that the evaluator perceived as being involved in principal evaluation by the greatest number of principals was the superintendent's designate (74%). The evaluator perceived as having the next greatest involvement (72.1%) was the superintendent. Sixty-two per cent of the principals indicated that teachers were involved in principal evaluation. The number of principals who perceived that assessment teams were involved in evaluation was small. The assessment team consisting of professional educators outside the school system had the highest percentage response of assessment teams, at 25.3%. An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the community had under eight per cent of the principals in agreement that this team was involved in principal evaluation.

Considering the extent to which evaluators should be involved in principal evaluation, just over 80% of the principals indicated that the superintendent should be involved in principal evaluation. Almost three quarters of the principals indicated agreement that the superintendent's designate should be involved in the evaluation of principals. With respect to groups acting as evaluators, slightly under three quarters of the principals perceived that the teachers should be involved.

An assessment team which included the superintendent, the principal, and a third party acceptable to both had the

Table 4-9

Percentage of Principal Responses Agreeing to Existing and Preferred Evaluators
N = 80

Evaluator	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Superintendent	72.1	82.0
Superintendent's designate	74.0	74.0
The principal alone	35.9	42.3
The teaching staff of the school	62.0	73.4
The students of the school	25.7	33.3
An assessment team consisting of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system	10.1	35.5
An assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal and a third person acceptable to both	21.8	65.4
An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community	7.6	22.8
An assessment team of professional educators outside the school system (e.g. Regional Office staff)	25.3	48.1

highest percentage (65.4%) of the principals in agreement that this team should be involved in principal evaluation. The assessment team with the lowest percentage of principals in agreement was a team of professional educators and lay members of the school community. In this case, only 22.8% of the principals agreed that the team should be involved in principal evaluation.

The findings of this section indicate that the principals perceived that the central office staff were and should be involved in principal evaluation. There was a suggestion that the teachers could be instrumental in the evaluation of the principal. There was also an indication that the principals did not perceive assessment teams as presently being involved, nor did they perceive that such teams should be involved in principal evaluation. There was strong evidence that the principals felt that lay members of the community were not presently, nor should they be, involved in principal evaluation.

Principals' Perceptions of Purposes For Evaluation

The third and final component of this portion of the study was to determine the percentage responses of the principals agreeing with the purposes for which principals were evaluated and the purposes for which principals should be evaluated. The results of these perceptions are now presented.

Table 4-10 reports the percentage responses of the

Table 4-10

Percentage of Principal Responses Agreeing to Existing And Preferred Purposes for Evaluation
N = 80

Purposes	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Evaluation should be an instrument for measuring personal success	53.2	58.4
Evaluation should form the basis of disciplinary measures. (e.g. Reduction of salary, removal from service, etc.)	36.3	46.3
All evaluation data should be used for improvement of administrative performance	75.1	96.3
Principals should be evaluated for appraisal for promotion to an open position	70.5	84.6

principals to the purposes for evaluation. Three quarters of the principals agreed with all evaluation data being used for the improvement of administrative performance. Slightly over one third of the principals perceived that evaluation was used for disciplinary measures. Over 95% of the principals felt that evaluation should be used for the purpose of improving the administrative performance of the principal. The purpose that was least preferred by principals was evaluation for disciplinary measures (46.3%).

The results suggest that most of the principals felt that assessment for improvement of performance was now and should be a purpose of evaluation. The findings indicate that a majority of the principals felt that evaluation for disciplinary measures was not currently a purpose, nor should it be considered a purpose, for evaluation.

This concludes the discussion of the first major purpose of this study, namely, an examination of principals' perceptions of existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation.

SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CRITERIA, EVALUATORS, AND PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

A second major purpose of this study was to discover the superintendents' perceptions of the existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation. This section

parallels the previous discussion which was related to the perceptions of the principals.

The responses of the superintendents were treated in the same manner as were the responses of the principals. In short, the percentage responses to "agree" and "strongly agree" were combined to form a single percentage score. This score was used to indicate the strength of agreement of the superintendents with criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Criteria

Presage criteria. An examination of Table 4-11 shows the percentage of the superintendents' responses to existing and preferred presage criteria. This table shows all but two criteria with over half of the superintendents in agreement that the criteria were important in principal evaluation. "Training in decision-making" had under 50% of the superintendents in agreement, and "Mastery of educational administrative studies" had under 40% of the superintendents in agreement. Over 90% of the superintendents were in agreement that the criterion "Skill for organizing" was given importance in principal evaluation.

With respect to the preferred presage criteria, just over 75% of the superintendents supported "Mastery of educational administration studies" as a criterion. The remainder of the presage criteria had over 80% of the

Table 4-11

Percentage of the Superintendent Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Presage Criteria
N = 77

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Capacity for contemplation of the future	74.4	97.3
Acceptability of personality	86.6	98.6
Expertise in school management	85.7	98.7
Courage to take risks	61.8	93.4
Ability to stimulate	83.1	100
Exactness in communication	70.1	96.1
Suitability of appearance	82.9	90.8
Capability for influencing	83.1	94.9
Mastery of educational administration studies	39.0	76.6
Skill for organizing	92.2	100
Training in decision making	46.1	86.8
Sensitive to when change is necessary	66.2	100

superintendents in agreement that importance should be given to these criteria in principal evaluation. All of the superintendents were in agreement that "Skill for organizing" and "Ability to stimulate" should be given importance.

The superintendents' responses to the presage criteria suggest that criteria on training were not as popular as other criteria for principal evaluation. Organizational abilities were supported by the superintendents as present evaluation criteria, suggesting that the superintendents felt that organization by principals was important. Regarding criteria that should be given importance, all the superintendents tended to be looking for indicators that showed the staff and students being stimulated, as well as all activities being organized. Although three quarters of the superintendents supported training in educational administration, it still was not as popular as the other criteria. This could suggest that post graduate studies were not considered very important in assessing the performance of the principal on the job.

Process Criteria. Table 4-12 shows the superintendents' responses to existing and preferred process criteria. The criterion with the lowest percentage agreement (37.7%) was "Regularly evaluates staff performance formally." The remaining process criteria had over 50% of the superintendents in agreement that they were given importance

Table 4-12

Percentage of the Superintendent Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Process Criteria
N = 77

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Interprets school program to the community	89.6	100
Organizes human and material resources	93.5	98.7
Reviews progress of students	87.0	100
Sets an example for staff to follow	87.0	98.7
Establishes communication channels deliberately	80.0	100
Maintains liaison with other principals	74.0	94.8
Establishes order of priority in problem solving	70.3	97.3
Regularly evaluates staff performance formally	37.7	88.3
Develops budget control systems	67.5	90.8
Involves staff in policy formation	81.8	98.7
Develops efficient methods for handling school routine	89.6	94.7

in principal evaluation. "Organizes human and material resources" had the largest percentage (93.5%) of the superintendents in agreement that it was important in principal evaluation.

Each process criterion had over 80% of the superintendents in agreement that it should be given importance in principal evaluation. The criterion, "Regularly evaluates staff performance formally," received the lowest percentage of the superintendents' support, at 88.3%. All of the superintendents agreed that "Interprets school program to the community," "Reviews progress of students," and "Establishes communication channels deliberately" should be given importance in principal evaluation.

These results suggest that the superintendents did not perceive that regular, formal evaluation of teachers was a criterion that should be given less emphasis than other criteria for principal evaluation. The results for this category of criteria suggest that most of the superintendents felt that organization was an important criterion. The criteria that the group felt should be used suggest that the superintendents would prefer to judge the principals on their success in communicating. They also indicated that it was important for the principal to keep in touch with the progress of the students.

Product criteria. Table 4-13 reports the

superintendents' response to existing and preferred product criteria. According to this table, over 60% of the superintendents agreed that each product criteria was given importance in principal evaluation. The criterion with the lowest amount of support, "School building and grounds maintained," had 62.3% of the superintendents in agreement. The criterion with the highest percentage of superintendents in agreement, at just under 95%, was "School operated successfully."

With respect to preferred product criteria, all superintendents were in agreement that "School operated successfully," "Staff knowledgeable of school policy," and "Balance attained between innovative and proven programs" should be given importance in principal evaluation. Slightly over three quarters of the superintendents supported "Personnel located in the proper place at the predetermined time" as a preferred product criterion.

The results on the product criteria suggest that the superintendents felt that a successfully operated school was important and should be important in evaluating the principal. This finding suggests that the superintendents looked to the principals for the successful operation of the schools. There was an indication the superintendents wanted the principals to emphasize policy and maintain a balance between innovative and proven programs.

Table 4-13

Percentage of the Superintendent Responses Agreeing With the Importance of Existing and Preferred Product Criteria
N = 77

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Staff inspired to achieve goals	76.6	98.6
Decisions respected by staff	90.9	98.7
Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time	65.7	76.7
Delegated duties dischared by subordinates	80.3	94.8
Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change	59.7	98.7
Staff knowledgeable of school policy	72.4	100
Budget funds expended according to plan	80.5	98.7
School operated successfully	94.6	100
Students' perfcrmance recognized	81.8	96.1
School buildings and grounds maintained	62.3	83.1

Table 4-13 (continued)

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Balance attained between innovative and proven programs	72.3	100
Community well informed of school programs	71.1	97.4
Routine matters disposed of effectively	87.0	98.7

Superintendents' Perceptions of Evaluators

The second component of this major portion of the study was to examine the responses of the superintendents to selected evaluators. Attention will now be focused on these responses.

Examination of Table 4-14 discloses that 97.4% of the superintendents perceived themselves as being involved in principal evaluation. Slightly over 40% of the superintendents perceived the teachers as present evaluators. Over 40% of the superintendents perceived the assessment teams involving professional educators as being involved in principal evaluation. Less than six per cent perceived an assessment team that involved lay members of the school community as being involved in principal evaluation.

Table 4-14

Percentage of Superintendent Responses Agreeing to Existing and Preferred Evaluators
N = 77

Evaluator	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Superintendent	97.4	97.4
Superintendent's designate	81.7	90.3
The principal alone	18.7	25.0
The teaching staff of the school	43.3	76.6
The students of the school	16.0	37.7
An assessment team consisting of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system	6.8	37.9
An assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal and a third person acceptable to both	23.0	62.2
An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community	5.6	23.0
An assessment team of professional educators outside the school system (e.g. Regional Office staff)	43.9	64.0

When the superintendents considered which evaluators should be involved in principal evaluation, their highest percentage response (97.4%) was that the superintendent himself should be involved. Over 90% of the superintendents agreed that their designates should be involved. Over three quarters of the superintendents gave support to the teacher as a preferred evaluator. The evaluator with the lowest percentage support, at 23% of the superintendents in agreement that they should evaluate principals, was an assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community.

From these results, one can draw a suggestion that the central office was and should be involved in principal evaluation. This would suggest that although other evaluators would be considered, the superintendents wished to maintain a strong hand in evaluating their staff. It is interesting to note that over three quarters of the superintendents agreed to include the teaching staff as evaluators, suggesting that the superintendents agreed that the teachers may have much to offer in evaluating the principal.

Superintendents' Perceptions of Purposes For Evaluation

The third and final component for this major section was to examine the superintendents' perceptions of existing and preferred purposes for evaluation. In this section, the percentages of the superintendents agreeing with the

purposes for which principals were evaluated and the purposes for which they should be evaluated are considered.

It was found that over 87% of the superintendents agreed that principals were evaluated for the improvement of administrative performance. Only 27% of the superintendents agreed that principals were evaluated for disciplinary purposes.

When considering the preferred purpose for principal evaluation, slightly over 98% agreed that evaluation data should be used for the improvement of administrative performance. Forty per cent of the superintendents supported the purpose that evaluation should form a basis for disciplinary measures. This information is presented in Table 4-15.

As with the principals' perceptions presented in a previous section, the superintendents also desired to evaluate for improvements. This suggests that the superintendents felt that the purpose of evaluation was not for punitive reasons but rather for developmental reasons.

This concludes the discussion of the second major purpose of the study which was to examine the perceptions of the superintendents of existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation.

Table 4-15

Percentage of Superintendent Responses Agreeing to Existing And Preferred Purposes for Evaluation
N = 77

Criteria	Percentage	
	Existing	Preferred
Evaluation should be an instrument for measuring personal success	44.7	61.8
Evaluation should form the basis of disciplinary measures. (e.g. Reduction of salary, removal from service, etc.)	27.3	40.3
All evaluation data should be used for improvement of administrative performance	85.7	98.7
Principals should be evaluated for appraisal for promotion to an open position	74.6	81.3

COMPARISON OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED CRITERIA, EVALUATORS, AND PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

Attention will now be focused on the third major purpose of the study which was to compare responses of the principals to existing and preferred criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

When analyzing the responses, a mean score of 2.50 or larger was interpeted as indicating the respondents were in agreement with the specific criterion, evaluator, or purposes for evaluation. And the greater the mean score, the stronger the level of agreement.

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Criteria

The first component of this segment will be a presentation of the comparison of the principals' responses to existing and preferred presage criteria, process criteria, and product criteria.

Presage criteria. Examination of Table 4-16 shows a comparison of the difference between the means of the responses to the importance given and the importance that should be given to presage criteria. In this table, the difference between the means was not statistically significant for the criterion, "Mastery of educational administration studies." The difference between the means for "Suitability of appearance" was statistically significant at the 0.05 level, and "Capacity for

Table 4-16

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Presage Criteria

Criteria	Existing		Preferred		
	$\overline{X}$	sd	$\overline{X}$	sd	t
Capacity for contemplation of the future	2.59	0.67	3.20	0.62	6.96[1]
Acceptability of personality	3.12	0.61	3.42	0.55	4.47[1]
Expertise in school management	3.11	0.57	3.42	0.55	4.07[1]
Courage to take risks	2.57	0.78	3.32	0.61	7.64[1]
Ability to stimulate	2.96	0.59	3.56	0.53	7.12[1]
Exactness in communication	2.98	0.62	3.44	0.55	6.51[1]
Suitability of appearance	2.81	0.65	2.99	0.71	2.27[3]
Capability for influencing	2.95	0.62	3.22	0.61	3.03[2]
Mastery of educational administration studies	2.54	0.64	2.71	0.71	1.89
Skill for organizing	3.25	0.54	3.52	0.53	3.99[1]
Training in decision making	2.71	0.60	3.05	0.69	4.12[1]
Sensitive to when change is necessary	3.13	0.55	3.50	0.54	5.99[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

influencing" yielded a difference between the means that was statistically significant at the 0.01 level. For the remainder of the presage criteria, the difference between the means was statistically significant at the 0.001 level. For each criterion in this section, the mean of the responses as to the importance that should be given was greater than the mean of the responses for the importance given.

For both the existing and the preferred responses to educational administration studies, although the difference was not statistically significant, there was some indication that the principals did not give, nor do they wish to give, importance to this item as a criterion for evaluation. Statistically significant differences suggest that the principals would give the criteria more importance in principal evaluation than they presently received.

Process Criteria. The second classification of criteria wherein the difference between the means of the responses of the principals to existing and preferred criteria is process criteria.

The information presented in Table 4-17 reveals that the difference between the means of the importance given and the importance that should be given process criteria was statistically significant at the 0.001 level, excepting "Regularly evaluates staff performance formally," wherein the difference was reported as not being statistically

Table 4-17

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Process Criteria

Criteria	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Interprets school program to the community	3.05	0.53	3.45	0.50	5.69[1]
Organizes human and material resources	3.34	0.53	3.71	0.46	6.88[1]
Reviews progress of students	2.97	0.66	3.28	0.68	4.14[1]
Sets and example for staff to follow	3.13	0.67	3.51	0.62	4.47[1]
Establishes communication channels deliberately	2.99	0.67	3.44	0.59	6.00[1]
Maintains liaison with other principals	2.68	0.79	3.28	0.55	7.26[1]
Establishes order of priority in problem solving	2.81	0.72	3.34	0.62	7.19[1]
Regularly evaluates staff performance formally	2.73	0.81	2.72	0.93	0.13
Develops budget control systems	2.63	0.75	3.00	0.62	4.03[1]
Involves staff in policy formation	3.13	0.60	3.50	0.53	5.99[1]
Develops efficient methods for handling school routine	3.04	0.58	3.30	0.56	4.31[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level

significant. As with presage criteria, the mean for the preferred responses was larger than the existing responses.

The lack of a statistical difference between the means for regular formal evaluation of staff as a criterion for principal evaluation suggests that the principals perceived that the importance given to this criterion was as it should be. The remaining process criteria were perceived not to have received as much importance in principal evaluation as they should have.

Product criteria. The third classification of criteria to be considered is product criteria. The following passage examines the differences between how the principals perceived the importance given and the importance that should be given to product criteria.

Examination of Table 4-18 reveals that the difference between the means for the criterion "School building and grounds maintained" was not statistically significant. The differences between the means for the criteria "Students' performance recognized," and "Budget funds expended according to plan" were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. "School operated successfully" and "Routine matters disposed on effectively" revealed differences between their means that were statistically significant at the 0.01 level. All the other differences between the means were recorded as being statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

Table 4-18

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Product Criteria

Criteria	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Staff inspired to achieve goals	3.10	0.54	3.59	0.50	7.33[1]
Decisions respected by staff	3.01	0.57	3.47	0.60	6.19[1]
Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time	2.64	0.59	2.99	0.71	3.94[1]
Delegated duties dischared by subordinates	2.95	0.71	3.31	0.67	4.93[1]
Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change	2.52	0.75	3.15	0.58	7.30[1]
Staff knowledgeable of school policy	3.00	0.62	3.41	0.69	5.85[1]
Budget funds expended according to plan	2.91	0.72	3.15	0.64	2.77[3]
School operated successfully	3.37	0.69	3.64	0.56	3.33[2]
Students' performance recognized	2.99	0.61	3.21	0.65	2.58[3]
School buildings and grounds maintained	2.75	0.67	2.81	0.77	0.74

Table 4-18 (continued)

Criteria	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Balance attained between innovative and proven programs	2.84	0.63	3.16	0.59	4.61[1]
Community well informed of school programs	2.95	0.65	3.40	0.61	5.29[1]
Routine matters disposed of effectively	3.00	0.60	3.24	0.53	3.31[2]

[1] significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

The findings presented in this table suggest that principals perceived the standards for building and grounds maintenance as being given and requiring importance in principal evaluation to the same extent. Regarding the significant differences for the remaining criteria, it appears that the principals felt that greater importance should be given to the criteria for principal evaluation than had actually been given.

Averaged criteria. Averages of the existing and preferred responses for each criterion classification were compared. A comparison of the average of the means for each classification showed that the difference between the means was statistically significant at the 0.001 level

(Table 4-19)

Table 4-19

Comparision of Principals' Perceptions of Averaged Criteria

Criteria	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Pressage	2.84	0.36	3.52	0.42	15.22[1]
Product	2.89	0.37	3.23	0.40	8.50[1]
Process	2.94	0.36	3.39	0.33	9.43[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level

As with the individual criteria, the averaged means for the preferred criteria were larger than the averaged means for existing criteria. The differences between the means being statistically significant suggests that the principals perceived that greater importance should be given to each criteria classification when used for principal evaluation.

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Evaluators

The comparison between existing and preferred responses of the principals to selected evaluators constitutes the second component of this major portion of the study.

An examination of Table 4-20 discloses that the means for the extent to which evaluators should be involved were larger than the means for the extent to which evaluators

Table 4-20

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing And Preferred Evaluators

Evaluators	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Superintendent	2.95	0.95	3.18	0.82	2.91[2]
Superintendent's designate	2.77	0.84	2.78	0.75	0.61
The principal alone	2.22	0.85	2.27	0.91	0.60
The teaching staff of the school	2.61	0.82	2.72	0.73	1.15
The students of the school	1.92	0.80	2.04	0.80	1.41
An assessment team consisting of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system	1.63	0.66	2.11	0.89	5.25[1]
An assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal and a third person acceptable to both	1.92	0.79	2.74	0.83	8.24[1]
An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community	1.61	0.63	1.89	0.78	4.14[1]
An assessment team of professional educators outside the school system (e.g. Regional Office staff)	1.97	0.83	2.33	0.92	4.63[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level

were involved in principal evaluation. There was no statistically significant difference between the means for the superintendents' designates, the principal, the teaching staff, and the students as evaluators. The difference between the means for the superintendent as an evaluator was statistically significant at the 0.01 level. For the other evaluators, the difference between the means was statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

The results reported suggest that there was a preference that the superintendent be involved in principal evaluation. Although there was a difference between the means for assessment teams, the size of the means indicated that assessment teams should not be involved in principal evaluation. If there was any preference, it would appear that the principals preferred to have an assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal, and a third person acceptable to both.

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes For Evaluation

It was found that the differences between the means regarding the purposes for which principals were evaluated and should be evaluated, were not statistically significant for evaluation as an instrument for personal success or evaluation as a basis for disciplinary measures. The differences between the means for evaluation for promotion to an open position and evaluation for improvement of

administrative performance were statistically significant at the 0.01 and 0.001 level, respectively. This information is presented in Table 4-21. The results suggest that the principals preferred that evaluation be undertaken for promotion to an open position and for improvement of performance. This further suggests that the principals preferred that evaluations be made for developmental reasons rather than for punitive reasons.

The previous section drew attention to a comparison of principal responses to existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation.

COMPARISON OF SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED CRITERIA, EVALUATORS, AND PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

The following passage will present the results of a comparison of the responses of superintendents to existing and preferred criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation. This section deals with the fourth major purpose of the study.

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Criteria

A comparison of the superintendents' responses to existing and preferred criteria will be the first component of this section.

Presage criteria. The first classification of criteria

Table 4-21

Comparison of Principals' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes for Evaluation

Purposes	Existing $\overline{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\overline{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Evaluation should be an instrument for measuring personal success	2.44	0.73	2.55	0.77	1.38
Evaluation should form the basis of disciplinary measures. (e.g. Reduction of salary, removal from service, etc.)	2.19	0.84	2.25	0.88	0.84
All evaluation data should be used for improvement of administrative performance	2.90	0.81	3.63	0.60	7.71[1]
Principals should be evaluated for appraisal for promotion to an open position	2.74	0.80	2.99	0.75	3.13[2]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level

to be considered for differences between the means of superintendents' indications of the existing and preferred criteria is the presage classification. An examination of Table 4-22 shows that the differences between the means for the superintendents' responses were statistically significant for all criteria. "Suitability of appearance" had a difference significant at the 0.05 level, and the remainder of the means revealed differences at the 0.001 level.

The means of the importance given to the criteria, "Courage to take risks," and "Exactness in communiation," were larger than the means for the importance that the superintendents felt should be given. The remaining criteria yielded means for the preferred criteria larger than the means for the existing criteria.

The results presented in this section suggest that the superintendents perceived that the criteria related to risk-taking and communication were given more importance than they preferred to be given in principal evaluation. All the remaining criteria in this classification were preferred by the superintendents for principal evaluation.

Process criteria. The comparisons between the means of existing and preferred responses to process criteria will now be presented. For this classification, the means for the importance that should be given criteria were larger than the means for the importance that was given. The differences

Table 4-22

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Presage Criteria

Criteria	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Capacity for contemplation of the future	2.80	0.57	3.32	0.53	6.60[1]
Acceptability of personality	3.07	0.62	3.44	0.53	4.80[1]
Expertise in school management	3.04	0.62	3.58	0.52	6.67[1]
Courage to take risks	2.66	0.68	2.26	0.62	6.73[1]
Ability to stimulate	2.99	0.58	3.62	0.49	8.75[1]
Exactness in communication	2.81	0.65	2.49	0.58	7.89[1]
Suitability of appearance	2.83	0.50	3.05	0.54	3.27[3]
Capability for influencing	2.94	0.52	3.40	0.63	5.57[1]
Mastery of educational administration studies	2.36	0.63	2.91	0.69	6.08[1]
Skill for organizing	3.10	0.55	3.57	0.50	6.62[1]
Training in decision making	2.49	0.72	3.24	0.67	7.99[1]
Sensitive to when change is necessary	2.73	0.66	3.45	0.50	8.09[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

between the means for all process criteria were statistically significant at the 0.001 level. The information is presented in Table 4-23.

The findings in this section suggest that the superintendents would give more importance to process criteria in the future than they do now.

Product criteria. The comparison of responses of superintendents to the importance of existing and preferred product criteria is the third classification to be considered. A comparison of means for this classification is now presented.

Table 4-24 reveals the comparison between existing and preferred importance given to product criteria by the superintendents. The criterion, "Delegated duties discharged by subordinates," had a larger mean for existing importance than the mean for preferred importance. For the remainder of the criteria, the reverse was true. "Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time" had a difference that was statistically significant at the 0.05 level, while the remaining criteria revealed differences that were statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

The results suggest, as with previous results, that there was agreement that the suggested criteria should be used more extensively in principal evaluation, with the exception that superintendents agreed that the discharge of delegated duties was given more importance now than it

Table 4-23

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Process Criteria

Criteria	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Interprets school program to the community	3.04	0.50	3.62	0.49	8.34[1]
Organizes human and material resources	3.19	0.54	3.68	0.50	6.80[1]
Reviews progress of students	3.00	0.57	3.47	0.50	6.23[1]
Sets an example for staff to follow	3.08	0.62	3.61	0.52	7.30[1]
Establishes communication channels deliberately	2.87	0.60	3.56	0.50	8.38[1]
Maintains liaison with other principals	2.79	0.61	3.26	0.59	6.41[1]
Establishes order of priority in problem solving	2.73	0.69	3.38	0.54	7.12[1]
Regularly evaluates staff performance formally	2.32	0.73	3.39	0.80	10.13[1]
Develops budget control systems	2.72	0.56	3.09	0.57	4.21[1]
Involves staff in policy formation	2.94	0.64	3.42	0.57	6.03[1]
Develops efficient methods for handling school routine	2.97	0.43	3.29	0.51	5.02[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level

Table 4-24

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Product Criteria

Criteria	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Staff inspired to achieve goals	2.92	0.71	3.78	0.45	10.03[1]
Decisions respected by staff	3.03	0.56	3.49	0.53	7.13[1]
Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time	2.71	0.61	2.90	0.61	2.88[3]
Delegated duties dischared by subordinates	3.89	0.53	3.33	0.58	6.35[1]
Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change	2.60	0.67	3.35	0.51	7.97[1]
Staff knowledgeable of school policy	2.78	0.62	3.43	0.50	7.57[1]
Budget funds expended according to plan	2.88	0.61	3.36	0.51	6.19[1]
School operated successfully	3.24	0.54	3.59	0.50	5.17[1]
Students' performance recognized	2.88	0.54	2.30	0.54	5.93[1]
School buildings and grounds maintained	2.61	0.61	2.92	0.60	4.82[1]

Table 4-24 (continued)

Criteria	Percentage $\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	t
Balance attained between innovative and proven programs	2.71	0.59	3.18	0.39	6.43[1]
Community well informed of school programs	2.76	0.57	3.47	0.55	7.98[1]
Routine matters disposed of effectively	3.01	0.57	3.27	0.48	3.84[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

should be.

Averaged Criteria. The responses of the superintendents for each criterion classification were averaged and the means were then compared for differences. An examination of Table 4-25 reveals that the preferred means were larger than the existing means for each classification. Also, the differences between the means were found to be statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

These results suggest that the superintendents would prefer to give greater emphasis to each classification of criteria as a standard for principal evaluation.

Table 4-25

Comparision of Superintendents' Perceptions of Averaged Criteria

Criteria	Existing		Preferred		
	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	t
Pressage	2.79	0.35	3.63	0.34	16.12[1]
Product	2.82	0.31	3.0	0.28	11.68[1]
Process	2.86	0.31	3.40	0.30	12.67[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Evaluators

A second component of this major portion of this study was to compare the superintendents' perceptions of existing and preferred evaluators. The data for this comparison are presented in Table 4-26. The examination of the table reveals that all the means were larger for the evaluators who should be involved than the means for the evaluators who were involved. It was found that the difference between the means for the principal as an evaluator was not statistically significant. The differences between the means for the remaining evaluators were statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

The findings show that all evaluators except the principal were preferred more strongly than at present by the superintendents. This suggests that the superintendents were least comfortable with the principal acting as his own

Table 4-26

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Evaluators

Evaluators	Existing $\bar{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\bar{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Superintendent	3.58	0.59	3.78	0.53	3.72[1]
Superintendent's designate	2.97	0.76	3.25	0.69	3.49[1]
The principal alone	1.89	0.80	1.93	0.95	0.54
The teaching staff of the school	2.38	0.71	2.83	0.70	4.94[1]
The students of the school	1.81	0.69	2.25	0.66	5.28[1]
An assessment team consisting of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system	1.58	0.62	2.16	0.87	5.94[1]
An assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal and a third person acceptable to both	1.86	0.76	2.61	0.80	7.20[1]
An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community	1.60	0.60	2.03	0.71	5.65[1]
An assessment team of professional educators outside the school system (e.g. Regional Office staff)	2.25	0.89	2.66	0.85	4.85[1]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level

evaluator, and that they preferred any other evaluator to judge the principal.

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes For Evaluation

The third component of this major portion of the study is the superintendents' responses indicating their perceptions of existing and preferred purposes for evaluation. The information presented in Table 4-27 is a comparison of the means for the purposes for evaluation. In this section, the means for preferred purposes for evaluation were larger than the means for existing purposes for evaluation.

The differences between the means for all purposes were statistically significant. Evaluation forming the basis for disciplinary measures had a difference that was statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The differences between the means for evaluation as an instrument for personal success and evaluation for promotion were statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Evaluation for the improvement of performance had a difference between the means that was statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

The findings suggest that all purposes for evaluation were preferred more strongly than at present for the evaluation of the principal. Although the differences were statistically significant, the relatively low mean for evaluation for disciplinary measures indicated that this

Table 4-27

Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Existing and Preferred Purposes for Evaluation

Purposes	Existing $\overline{X}$	Existing sd	Preferred $\overline{X}$	Preferred sd	t
Evaluation should be an instrument for measuring personal success	2.38	0.69	2.61	0.80	2.85[2]
Evaluation should form the basis of disciplinary measures. (e.g. Reduction of salary, removal from service, etc.)	2.03	0.73	2.19	0.83	2.41[3]
All evaluation data should be used for improvement of administrative performance	3.14	0.68	3.70	0.49	7.67[1]
Principals should be evaluated for appraisal for promotion to an open position	2.77	0.58	3.00	0.66	3.24[2]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

purpose was not popular with the superintendents.

This concludes the discussion of the fourth of six major purposes of the study. In this portion the comparison of the superintendents' responses to existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation has been presented.

COMPARISON OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING CRITERIA, EVALUATORS, AND PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

The fifth major portion of the study will now be presented. Comparison of the the superintendents' and principals' responses will be made for the components of criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Criteria

The first component of this portion was the comparison of the superintendents' and principals' responses to existing criteria. The comparisons are presented according to the criterion classifications.

Presage criteria. Table 4-28 reports the differences of the means for the superintendents' and the principals' perceptions of actual importance of presage criteria. The differences between the means for "Capacity for contemplation of the future" and "Training in decision-making" were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. All the differences for the other criteria were not

Table 4-28

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Presage Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	sd	t
Capacity for contemplation of the future	2.80	0.57	2.59	0.67	2.08[3]
Acceptability of personality	3.07	0.62	3.13	0.61	0.62
Expertise in school management	3.04	0.62	3.11	0.57	0.77
Courage to take risks	2.66	0.68	2.55	0.78	0.75
Ability to stimulate	2.99	0.57	2.96	0.59	0.27
Exactness in communication	2.81	0.65	2.98	0.62	1.68
Suitability of appearance	2.83	0.50	2.81	0.65	0.23
Capability for influencing	2.94	0.52	2.95	0.62	0.16
Mastery of educational administration studies	2.36	0.63	2.54	0.64	1.72
Skill for organizing	3.10	0.55	3.25	0.54	1.70
Training in decision making	2.49	0.72	2.72	0.60	2.16[3]
Sensitive to when change is necessary	2.73	0.66	2.85	0.55	1.26

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

statistically significant.

These findings suggest that the superintendents felt that future orientation is a more important criterion than do the principals. More principals viewed training in decision-making as being important now than do the superintendents. The findings further suggest that for the balance of the criteria, the superintendents and the principals tended to view the presage criteria the same way in that they were agreed on the level of importance each should have for principal evaluation.

Process criteria. For the second classification of criteria, it was found that the difference between the means for the superintendents and principals was statistically significant for the criterion," Regularly evaluates staff performance formally." In this case the difference was statistically significant at the 0.001 level. For this comparison, the mean for the principals was larger than that of the superintendents. The differences between the means for the remaining criteria were not statistically significant. This information is presented in Table 4-29.

There is a suggestion in these findings that more principals presently perceived that evaluation of staff was given importance in their evaluation; fewer superintendents agreed that this was the case. The findings indicate that the superintendents and the principals perceived the remaining process criteria as having the same importance in

Table 4-29

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Process Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	sd	t
Interprets school program to the community	3.04	0.50	3.05	0.53	0.13
Organizes human and material resources	3.19	0.54	3.34	0.53	1.68
Reviews progress of students	3.00	0.56	2.96	0.67	0.38
Sets an example for staff to follow	3.08	0.62	3.14	0.67	0.59
Establishes communication channels deliberately	2.87	0.60	2.99	0.67	1.18
Maintains liaison with other principals	2.79	0.61	2.68	0.79	1.04
Establishes order of priority in problem solving	2.73	0.69	2.81	0.72	0.71
Regularly evaluates staff performance formally	2.32	0.73	2.73	0.81	3.24[1]
Develops budget control systems	2.73	0.55	2.63	0.75	0.97
Involves staff in policy formation	2.94	0.64	2.13	0.60	1.92
Develops efficient methods for handling school routine	2.97	0.43	3.04	0.58	0.78

[1] significant at 0.001 level

principal evaluation.

Product criteria. The difference between the means of the responses of the superintendents and the principals to existing product criteria is the third comparison to be made. Table 4-30 reports the differences in the means of the responses by superintendents and principals to product criteria. In this table, the differences between the means for "Staff knowledgeable of school policy" and "Community well informed of school programs" were reported as statistically significant at the 0.05 level. For both of the above-mentioned criteria, the principals indicated stronger agreement to their importance than did the superintendents.

The remainder of the product criteria did not have statistically significant differences in the means between the superintendents' and principals' responses. The results presented indicate that the principals and superintendents differed on their perceptions of the importance given to the knowledge of school policy and the community's knowing what was going on. In both cases there were indications that principals felt more strongly that these factors were important than did the superintendents.

Averaged criteria. The final comparison between superintendents' and principals' responses was for the average means of presage, process, and product. It was found that the differences between the means when averaged were not statistically significant. This information is presented

Table 4-30

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Product Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	Superintendent sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	Principal sd	t
Staff inspired to achieve goals	2.92	0.70	3.10	0.54	1.77
Decisions respected by staff	3.03	0.56	3.01	0.57	0.15
Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time	2.71	0.62	2.64	0.59	0.78
Delegated duties dischared by subordinates	2.89	0.53	2.94	0.71	0.41
Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change	2.60	0.67	2.52	0.75	0.69
Staff knowledgeable of school policy	2.78	0.62	3.00	0.62	2.25[3]
Budget funds expended according to plan	2.88	0.61	2.91	0.72	0.28
School operated successfully	3.24	0.54	3.37	0.69	1.32
Students' performance recognized	2.88	0.54	2.99	0.61	1.14
School buildings and grounds maintained	2.61	0.61	2.75	0.67	1.37

Table 4-30 (continued)

Criteria	Percentage				
	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	t
Balance attained between innovative and proven programs	2.71	0.59	2.84	0.63	1.28
Community well informed of school programs	2.75	0.57	2.95	0.65	2.03[3]
Routine matters disposed of effectively	3.01	0.57	3.00	0.60	0.14

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

in Table 4-31.

The results, when the average means were compared, indicate that the principals and superintendents tend to treat the existing criteria in the same way.

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Evaluators

A third component of this major portion of the study was to compare the responses of the superintendents and principals to certain evaluators. A discussion of this comparison will now be presented.

The information presented in Table 4-32 reveals that differences between the perceptions of superintendents and the principals were statistically significant for only two evaluators. For the superintendent as an evaluator, the mean

Table 4-31

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Averaged Existing Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	sd	t
Presage	2.79	0.35	2.84	0.36	0.76
Product	2.83	0.31	2.89	0.37	1.27
Process	2.86	0.31	2.94	0.36	1.50

score for the superintendents was significantly greater (0.001 level) than the mean score for the principals. The mean for the principal as an evaluator was significantly larger (0.05 level) for the principals than for the superintendents. None of the remaining perceptions of evaluators had differences that were statistically significantly.

The results contained in this table suggest that the superintendents and the principals differed as to how they saw themselves as evaluators. The superintendents perceived themselves presently involved in evaluation to a greater extent than did the principals. In contrast, the principals perceived themselves as being involved more in evaluation than did the superintendents. The principals and the superintendents agreed on the extent of involvement of the remaining evaluators.

Table 4-32

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Existing Evaluators

Evaluators	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	sd	t
Superintendent	3.58	0.59	2.92	0.97	5.14[1]
Superintendent's designate	2.97	0.76	2.77	0.84	1.56
The principal alone	1.89	0.80	2.22	0.85	2.44[3]
The teaching staff of the school	2.38	0.71	2.61	0.82	1.83
The students of the school	1.81	0.69	1.92	0.80	0.90
An assessment team consisting of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system	1.58	0.62	1.63	0.66	0.55
An assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal and a third person acceptable to both	1.86	0.76	1.92	0.79	0.46
An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community	1.60	0.60	1.61	0.63	0.10
An assessment team of professional educators outside the school system (e.g. Regional Office staff)	2.25	0.89	1.97	0.83	1.94

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions Of Existing Purposes for Evaluation

The final component of this major portion of the study is to make a comparison between the perception of the superintendents and the principals concerning the existing purposes for evaluation. Table 4-33 examines these differences. According to this table, the only statistically significant difference in the responses was regarding the use of evaluation data for the improvement of administrative performance. This difference was statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The superintendents indicated a stronger agreement than the principals did with this item. The remaining purposes did not elicit responses that differed significantly.

The results indicate that the superintendents viewed their evaluation more for the improvement of performance than did the principals. For the remaining purposes, superintendents and principals viewed the purposes in the same light.

The previous sections considered the differences between the responses of the superintendents and the principals to selected criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation. Comparisons were made between the means of the responses of superintendents and principals as they perceived the existing evaluation practices.

Table 4-33

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions Of Existing Purposes for Evaluation

Purposes	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	Superintendent sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	Principal sd	t
Evaluation should be an instrument for measuring personal success	2.38	0.69	2.44	0.73	0.52
Evaluation should form the basis of disciplinary measures. (e.g. Reduction of salary, removal from service, etc.)	2.03	0.73	2.19	0.84	1.28
All evaluation data should be used for improvement of administrative performance	3.14	0.68	2.90	0.81	2.03[3]
Principals should be evaluated for appraisal for promotion to an open position	2.77	0.58	2.74	0.80	0.26

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

COMPARISON OF SUPERINTENDENTS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PREFERRED CRITERIA, EVALUATORS, AND PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

The final problem of this study will now be considered. Attention will be drawn in the following paragraphs to the differences in the superintendents' perceptions and the principals' perceptions of preferred criteria, preferred evaluators, and preferred purposes for evaluation. First to be presented will be the comparison for the three classification of criteria; presage, process, and product.

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Criteria

Presage criteria. For the first classification of criteria, it was found that the differences between the means for the superintendents' responses and the principals' responses were not statistically significant. This information is presented in Table 4-34.

The findings presented suggest that the superintendents and the principals perceived that the presage criteria should have the same importance in principal evaluation. The size of the means indicated that these criteria should all be given importance in principal evaluation.

Process criteria. Table 4-35 reports on the differences between the means of the superintendents' responses and the principals' responses to preferred process criteria. The difference between the means for "Regularly evaluates staff

Table 4-34

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Presage Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	sd	t
Capacity for contemplation of the future	3.32	0.53	3.20	0.62	1.33
Acceptability of personality	3.44	0.53	3.42	0.55	0.19
Expertise in school management	3.58	0.52	3.43	0.55	1.87
Courage to take risks	3.26	0.62	3.32	0.61	0.54
Ability to stimulate	3.62	0.50	3.56	0.53	0.75
Exactness in communication	3.49	0.58	3.44	0.55	0.62
Suitability of appearance	3.05	0.54	2.99	0.71	0.64
Capability for influencing	3.47	0.64	3.22	0.61	1.88
Mastery of educational administration studies	2.91	0.69	2.71	0.71	1.82
Skill for organizing	3.57	0.50	3.52	0.53	0.64
Training in decision making	3.24	0.67	3.05	0.67	1.69
Sensitive to when change is necessary	3.45	0.50	3.38	0.54	0.96

Table 4-35

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Process Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	Superintendent sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	Principal sd	t
Interprets school program to the community	3.62	0.49	3.45	0.50	2.20[3]
Organizes human and material resources	3.68	0.50	3.71	0.46	0.49
Reviews progress of students	3.47	0.50	3.28	0.68	2.04[3]
Sets an example for staff to follow	3.61	0.52	3.51	0.62	1.06
Establishes communication channels deliberately	3.56	0.50	3.44	0.59	1.32
Maintains liaison with other principals	3.26	0.59	3.28	0.55	0.17
Establishes order of priority in problem solving	3.38	0.54	3.34	0.62	0.39
Regularly evaluates staff performance formally	3.39	0.80	2.72	0.93	4.80[1]
Develops budget control systems	3.09	0.57	3.00	0.62	0.97
Involves staff in policy formation	3.42	0.57	3.50	0.53	0.96
Develops efficient methods for handling school routine	3.29	0.51	3.30	0.56	0.17

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

performance formally" was statistically significant at the 0.001 level. For this criterion, the mean of the superintendents' responses was higher than the mean of the principals' responses. The criteria "Interprets school program to the community" and "Reviews progress of students" had reported differences that were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. For both of these criteria, the means of the responses of the superintendents were larger than the means of the responses of the principals. The remaining process criteria did not show differences that were statistically significant.

It is suggested by the findings that the superintendents were in strcnger agreement that formal staff evaluation, interpretation of program, and the progress of students should be given importance than were the principals. The remainder of the comparisons yielded differences that indicated that the principals and the superintendents gave these criteria the same importance.

Product criteria. A comparison between superintendents' and principals' responses to the third classification of criteria, product criteria, will now be made.

The information presented in Table 4-36 reveals that in the comparison of the means of the responses of superintendents and principals to preferred product criteria there were only three criteria that showed differences that were statistically significant. The three criteria were:

Table 4-36

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Product Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	Superintendent sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	Principal sd	t
Staff inspired to achieve goals	3.78	0.45	3.59	0.50	2.49[3]
Decisions respected by staff	3.49	0.53	3.47	0.60	0.21
Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time	2.90	0.61	2.99	0.71	0.76
Delegated duties dischared by subordinates	3.33	0.58	3.31	0.67	0.17
Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change	3.35	0.51	3.15	0.58	2.28[3]
Staff knowledgeable of school policy	3.43	0.50	3.41	0.69	0.17
Budget funds expended according to plan	3.36	0.51	3.15	0.64	2.31[3]
School operated successfully	3.59	0.50	3.64	0.56	0.64
Students' performance recognized	3.30	0.54	3.21	0.65	0.90
School buildings and grounds maintained	2.92	0.60	2.81	0.77	1.00

Table 4-36 (continued)

Criteria	Percentage $\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	t
Balance attained between innovative and proven programs	3.18	0.39	3.16	0.59	0.25
Community well informed of school programs	3.46	0.55	3.40	0.61	0.65
Routine matters disposed of effectively	3.27	0.48	3.24	0.53	0.44

[1] Significant at0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

"Staff inspired to achieve goals," "Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change," and "Budget funds expended according to plan." For each of these, the differences were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The means of the responses of the superintendents were larger than the means of the responses of the principals.

The findings suggest that budget controls were more important to the superintendents than to the principals. Also inspiration of staff and the ability to overcome organizational resistance were given greater importance by the superintendents than by the principals.

Averaged criteria. The final comparison between

superintendents' and principals' responses to preferred criteria was for the average response in each classification. An examination of Table 4-37 reveals that the difference between the superintendents' responses and the principals' responses to preferred presage and product criteria were not statistically significant. The difference between the superintendents' and the principals' responses to process criteria was statistically significant at the 0.05 level. For process criteria, the average of the means for the superintendents' responses was larger than the average of the means for the principals' responses.

Table 4-37

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Averaged Preferred Criteria

Criteria	Superintendent		Principal		
	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	t
Pressage	3.63	0.34	3.52	0.43	1.87
Product	3.03	0.28	3.23	0.40	1.41
Process	3.40	0.30	3.30	0.33	2.11[3]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

The reported findings suggest that the superintendents perceived that on the average, process criteria should be given greater importance in principal evaluation than did

the principals.

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Evaluators

Also considered important to the study was a report on the differences between the superintendents' and principals' responses to preferred evaluators. The following presents a comparison of the two sources of responses, which is the second component of this major portion of the study.

Table 4-38 reports on the differences between the superintendents' responses and the principals' responses to preferred evaluators. The differences between the responses were statistically significant at the 0.001 level for the superintendent and his designate as possible evaluators. Regarding an assessment team of professional educators acting as evaluators of the principal, the difference between the mean was statistically significant at the 0.05 level. For the principal as an evaluator, the difference between the means was also statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The mean of the principals' responses was larger than the mean for the superintendents' responses for the principal as an evaluator. For the other evaluators reporting a statistically significant difference, the means of the superintendents' responses were larger than the means of the principals' responses.

There was the suggestion in these results that the principals preferred to evaluate themselves more strongly than the superintendents preferred this mode. There was also

Table 4-38

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Evaluators

Evaluators	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	sd	t
Superintendent	3.78	0.53	3.18	0.82	5.43[1]
Superintendent's designate	3.22	0.74	2.78	0.75	3.62[1]
The principal alone	1.92	0.95	2.27	0.91	2.33[3]
The teaching staff of the school	2.84	0.71	2.72	0.73	1.06
The students of the school	2.26	0.66	2.04	0.80	1.89
An assessment team consisting of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system	2.16	0.86	2.11	0.89	0.34
An assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal and a third person acceptable to both	2.65	0.82	2.74	0.83	0.71
An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community	2.01	0.71	1.89	0.78	1.05
An assessment team of professional educators outside the school system (e.g. Regional Office staff)	2.68	0.86	2.33	0.92	2.45[3]

[1] Significant at 0.001 level
[2] Significant at 0.01 level
[3] Significant at 0.05 level

the suggestion that the superintendents tended to think that outside evaluators or the central office staff were more important as evaluators than did the principals.

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions of Preferred Purposes for Evaluation

The final component of this major portion is the differences between the superintendents' and the principals' responses to preferred purposes for evaluation. It was found that there were no differences between the means that were statistically significant for the preferred evaluators. This information is presented in Table 4-39.

The findings in this section suggest that the superintendents and the principals perceived the presented purposes for evaluation in the same way. Both parties found the purposes important, but did not show differences in their perceived importance.

This concludes discussion of the sixth and last major purpose of this study, a comparison of the perceptions of the superintendents and principals to preferred criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, descriptions included the demographic variables of the sample and the perceptions of Alberta superintendents and principals regarding the evaluation of principals. Details of the responses by the two groups to

Table 4-39

Comparison of Superintendents' and Principals' Perceptions Of Preferred Purposes for Evaluation

Purposes	Superintendent $\bar{X}$	sd	Principal $\bar{X}$	sd	t
Evaluation should be an instrument for measuring personal success	2.61	0.80	2.55	0.77	0.47
Evaluation should form the basis of disciplinary measures. (e.g. Reduction of salary, removal from service, etc.)	2.19	0.83	2.25	0.88	0.40
All evaluation data should be used for improvement of administrative performance	3.70	0.49	3.63	0.60	0.87
Principals should be evaluated for appraisal for promotion to an open position	3.00	0.66	2.99	0.75	0.11

existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation were described. The differences between the superintendents' responses to existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation were discussed in detail. As with the superintendents, the principals' responses were also presented in detail. Finally, a discussion of the differences between the existing and preferred responses of the principals and the existing and preferred responses of the superintendents to criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation concluded this chapter.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of Alberta superintendents and principals regarding the evaluation of principals. To meet the purpose of the study, six related concerns were identified for examination. These concerns included the identification of the principals' and superintendents' perceptions of the importance given and the importance that should be given to criteria, the extent to which specific evaluators were and should be involved in evaluation, and the purpose for which principals were evaluated and should be evaluated.

Also examined were the differences between the principals' perceptions of existing and preferred criteria, existing and preferred evaluators, and existing and preferred purposes for evaluation. The differences for the same concerns were examined for the responses of the superintendents.

Also studied were the differences between the principals' and the superintendents' perceptions of existing criteria, existing evaluators, and existing purposes for evaluation was considered.

The final concern studied were the differences between the principals' and the superintendents' responses to

preferred criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation.

The questionnaire used in this study was developed by the researcher. The instrument as developed consisted of four parts. The first part was designed to collect important demographic information. The second part, which contained 36 criterion statements, was designed to identify criteria considered suitable for the evaluation of principals. The listing of nine possible evaluators made up the third part of the instrument, and the last part of the instrument outlined four possible purposes for which principals might be evaluated.

The data used in this study were collected by mailing the questionnaire to all the identified superintendents and to 100 randomly selected full-time principals in Alberta at the end of February, 1977. By the end of March, 1977, over 88% of the superintendents and 85% of the principals had returned the questionnaire.

The responses to the questionnaire were transferred to data cards so that the collected information could be processed by a computer, using the SPSS programs. The programs selected provided frequency counts and t-scores. The frequency counts were used for the analysis of the demographic variables, criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation. The t-scores were used to detect significant differences between the means of the responses by principals and superintendents to criteria, evaluators, and purposes for evaluation. For the t-scores, differences were

considered to be statistically significant when a probability level of 0.05 or less was reached.

Chapter 4 focussed on the analysis of the data. The chapter commenced with a brief discussion of the demographic variables for the superintendents and the principals. The discussion of these variables revealed that all the superintendents were male, approximately one third of them were under 41 years of age, one third had five years or less than five years experience as a superintendent, slightly over five per cent of them were employed in urban centers, and one third held at least a Master's degree.

The variables for the principals disclosed that 90% were male, just under 40% of them were under 41 years of age, one third had five years or less than five years of experience as a principal, approximately on third of them held at least a Master's degree, and none were former superintendents. The principals tended to be employed in schools with a staff size between 11 and 30 teachers and served elementary or elementary-junior high school students.

The analysis of the data revealed the following:

1. The principals agreed that the criteria used in this study were and should be given importance in principal evaluation. The superintendents did not agree that criteria related to educational administration studies and regular evaluation of staff were given importance in principal evaluation. The superintendents agreed that the remaining criteria were given importance in principal evaluation. The

superintendents further indicated agreement that all the criteria should be used in principal evaluation.

2. The principals and the superintendents perceived that the superintendent and his designate were the primary evaluators, and they also perceived that these individuals should be the prime evaluators. Both the superintendents and the principals perceived that evaluation teams were not, nor should they be, given importance in principal evaluation.

3. Evaluation for the improvement of administration performance was and should be the primary purpose for evaluation, according to the perceptions of the principals and the superintendents. Both parties perceived that evaluation was not being performed for a disciplinary measure, nor should it be performed for that purpose.

4. Generally speaking, when differences between the means were compared for existing and preferred criteria, the comparisons for the principals yielded means for the preferred responses that were higher than for the existing criteria. The exceptions to this were for the criteria related to evaluation of staff and maintenance of grounds, where no differences were indicated.

The comparison of the means for the superintendents' responses showed that the existing means for criteria related to risk, communication, and sensitivity to change were higher than the preferred means for the same criteria. The remainder of the criteria in this comparison had means which were higher for the preferred responses than the means

for the existing responses.

5. The evaluator preferred by the principals was the superintendent. There was an indication that the principals had a stronger agreement with assessment teams, but none of the teams were seen to be evaluators currently, nor should they be evaluators of the principals.

The superintendents perceived that all evaluators but the principal would be preferred as evaluators.

6. The principals indicated that they preferred purposes for evaluation that involved improvement of administrative performance and promotion to an open position. The superintendents indicated that they preferred all purposes for evaluation as listed in this study.

7. The comparison of means for superintendents regarding existing criteria indicated that the superintendents were in stronger agreement that contemplation of the future was a criterion than did the principals. The principals were in stronger agreement that training in decision-making, regular formal evaluation of the staff, staff knowledgeable of school policy, and the community informed were more important than did the superintendents.

For preferred criteria, the superintendents were in stronger agreement than the principals that formal staff evaluation, interpretation of school program to the community, and development of budget control systems should be given importance in principal evaluation. The averaged

criteria indicated that the superintendents agreed that process criteria should be given more importance in principal evaluation.

8. As existing evaluators, the superintendents perceived themselves as the prime evaluators of the principals. The principals, on the other hand, perceived themselves as the existing evaluators.

For preferred evaluators, the same relationship was true as for existing evaluators.

9. The existing purposes for evaluation had the superintendents in stronger agreement than the principals that evaluation should be based on improvement of administrative performance of the principal. As for preferred purposes, no differnce was expressed between the principls and the superintendents.

CONCLUSIONS

1. With the exception of two criteria, it is concluded that the superintendents and the principals perceived that there are common criteria considered important in the evaluation of principals. It is further concluded that both parties agreed that importance should be given to the criteria in this study.

The comparison of existing and preferred criteria suggests that both parties preferred the use of the outlined criteria. With respect to the criteria classifications, all three categories were preferred. This leads to the

conclusion that the emphasis on existing criteria used for evaluative purposes should be re-examined.

A comparison of the principals' and the superintendents' responses to existing criteria revealed that the superintendents perceived future orientation as important whereas the principals perceived decision making, formal staff evaluation, school policy, and community informed as being important. This suggests, that although there is agreement on the criteria, there are differences in the priority of the criteria.

It is concluded that there are no differences in the responses by the superintendents and the principals to classifications of presage and product criteria. The superintendents had a greater preference for the category of process criteria.

2. Another conclusion of this study is that principals and superintendents perceived the central office staff as existing evaluators. Further, both parties perceived that evaluators should come from the central office. It is further concluded that both parties did not perceive, as existing nor as preferred, evaluators who come from outside the system or who are in the form of teams. A comparison of responses for evaluators showed that the superintendents preferred any of the evaluators but the principal. Further comparison revealed that each party perceived themselves as the evaluator. One can conclude that there is no agreement between the superintendents and the principals as to who are

and who should be the evaluators of principals.

3. The superintendents and the principals perceived that evaluation was and should be for the improvement of administrative performance. This suggests that when the principal is appointed, his abilities should be adequate for the position. It is concluded that the superintendents wished to improve their staff and the principals wished to improve their performance. Neither party perceived evaluation for disciplinary measures. This suggests that the superintendents wished to evaluate and have their principals improve as they saw the need for improvement. The principals, on the other hand, perceived that the improvement should be along the lines they perceived as the need for improvement. This suggests that there could be conflict between the two bodies as to what constitutes improvement.

IMPLICATIONS

1. The extent of agreement to most of the criteria items for evaluation implies that it should be possible to develop a set of criteria acceptable to superintendents and principals for the evaluation of the principal.

2. The results suggested that training in educational administration was not considered as important as other presage criteria by superintendents when evaluating principals. This may imply that greater efforts should be made in developing training programs that focus upon skills

required in principal evaluation.

3. There is an implication in the findings of this study that principals and superintendents are not aware of the acclaimed merits of team evaluation. This suggests that inservice training of the principals and the superintendents might be appropriate.

4. There is a further implication that the principals and the superintendents may require clarification as to the meaning of the improvement of administrative performance. There was a suggestion that the respondents had a different concept of what constitutes improvement of administrative performance. This implies that further research may be required in this area.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. The findings of this study suggest that additional criteria can be established for principal evaluation. A study could be conducted to establish such criteria and to develop a rank order of the importance of these criteria in principal evaluation.

2. Although both parties agreed that individuals should evaluate, there was a question regarding the merit of team evaluation. There is need for an investigation of the merits of team evaluation compared to the merits of individual evaluation.

3. There appears to be a lack of clarity as to what is meant by improvement of the administrative process. A study

could be developed to compare the differences between the perceptions of superintendents and principals regarding the administrative process.

4. The perceptions of teachers of principal evaluation could constitute another area for further study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Scarvia B., and others, eds. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. London: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Angoff, William H. "Measurement and Scaling." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third Edition. eds. Harris, Chester W., and Marie R. Liba. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1960.

Apple, Michael W., Michael J. Sobkoviak and Henry S Lufler Jr. eds. Educational Evaluation, Analysis and Responsibility. Berkely: MrCutchan Publishing, 1974.

Beall, L. "Evaluating the Principal," Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol. 2, (November, 1972), 36-39.

Bolton, John. "Collecting Evaluation Data," National Elementary Principal. Vol. 52, (February, 1973), 77-85.

Bossetti, Rino A. "Congruence of Expectations, Sensitivity to Perceptions, and Rated Administrative Effectiveness." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

Browder, Lesley H. ed. Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability. Berkeley: MrCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.

Carvell, James. "Evaluating Administrative Performance," Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol. 2, (November, 1972), 31-35.

Curtis, William H. Educational Resources Management System. Chigago: Association of School Business Officials, 1971.

Cooper, Norma C. "Instructor Evaluaton in Community Colleges," Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1972.

Davies, Joseph L. and Martin W. Essex eds. Educational Evaluation Official Proceedings of a Conference, Columbus: Ohio Department of Education, 1969.

Dolan, Patrick, and Benson Munger. "Evaluation and Due Process: Guidelines for Administrators," National Elementary Principal, Vol. 2, (December, 1961), 12-14.

Educational Technology Review Series No. 11, "Evaluation of Education," Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Educational Research Service, Inc. "Evaluating Administrative Performance," ERS Report, 1969.

Educational Research Service, Inc. "Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance," ERS Report, 1971.

Educational Research Service, Inc. "Evaluating Administrative Performance," ERS Report, 1974.

Enns, F. "Supervision: A Rationale," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 2, (April, 1963) 27-30.

Enns, F. "Perceptions in the Study of Administration," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 5, (March, 1966) 23-26.

Enns, F. "The Principal: Administrator," The Alberta Principal's Leadership Course, 1967, 11-17.

Fouks, Carver Coit. "An Analysis of Current Practice and Management Literature for Conducting Performance Appraisal and Pay Programs for School Administrators." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1976.

Gaslin, W. "Evaluation of Administrative Perfcrmance by a School's Teaching Staff," National Association of Secondary School Principal's Bulletin, Vol.58, (December, 1974), 72-81.

Gephart, William J. Evaluation: Past, Present and Future. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, n.d.

Glass, Gene V. "A Paradox about Excellence of Schools and the People in Them," Educational Researcher, Vol. 4, (March, 1975), 9-13.

Griedu, Calvin. "Public School Administration." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. (4th ed.). London: Collier-Macmillian Ltd., 1969, 1039-1047.

House, Ernest R. ed. School Evalution The Politics and Process. Berkely: McCutchan Publishing, 1973.

House, E.R., Rivers, W., and D. Stufflebeam. "An Assessment of the Michigan Accountability System," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 55, (June, 1974) 663-669.

Howsam, Robert B. "Current Issues in Evaluation," National Elementary Principal, Vol. 52, (February, 1973), 12-18.

Huber, J. "Accountability -- Dangers in Misapplication," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 58, (September, 1974), 13-18.

Jacobson, Paul., James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman. The Principalship: New Perspectives. Englewoods Cliffs: Printice-Hall, 1973.

Kellogg, M.S. What to do About Performance Appraisal. New York: American Management Association, 1965.

Landers, Thomas J. and Robert S. Silverman. "It's the Principal of the Thing," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 58, (Sseptember, 1974) 45-47.

Miklos, E. "Approaches to School Administration." Paper prepared for the Educational Division of the Commonwealth Secretariat, January, 1975.

Mitzel, H.E. "Teacher Effectiveness Criteria," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan Company, 1960.

Nicholson, Everett. "The Performance of Principals in the Accountability Syndrome," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 56, (May, 1972), 94-102.

Pharis, W. "The Evaluation of School Principals," National Elemeptary Principal, Vol. 52, (February, 1973) 36-38.

Pine, G.T. and Angelo V. Boy. "Necessary Conditions for Evaluating Teachers," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 59, (December, 1975) 18-23.

Pitts, John Harold. "A Study of Urban Administrators' Perceptions of Emphasis Placed on Selected Administrative Competencies." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1976.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel," National Elementary Principal, Vol. 52, (February, 1973) 39-44.

Popham, James W. An Evaluation Guidebook. Los Angeles: The Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1972.

Provus, Malcolm. Discrepancy Evaluation. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1971.

Ratsoy, E., E. Ingram, E Miklos, "Working Paper on Trends in School Administration Assessment." Prepared for the Calgary Roman Catholic Separate School District, October, 1976.

Redfern, G.B. "Accountability: Echoes from the Field," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. 55, (March/April, 1976) 42-46.

Rentsch, George J. "Assessing Administrative Performance," National Association of Secondary School Principals'

Bulletin, Vol. 60, (September, 1976) 77-83.

Rosenberg, Max. "How to Evaluate your Principal Without Scaring (or Turning) Them Off," American School Board Journal, Vol. 91, (June, 1973) 35-36.

Sanacore, J. "How Teachers can Evaluate Their Principals," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 60, (October, 1976) 98-101.

Sanders, James R. and Donald J Cunningham. "A Structure For Formative Evaluation in Product Development," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 43, (Spring, 1973) 217-236.

Sause, E.F. "Demonstrating Competencey As A Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 58, (September, 1974) 19-28.

Scara, S.J. and R. Janta. Accountability in American Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1972.

Schramm, William George. "Formal Evaluation of Administrators in the Six-County Metropolitan Detroit Area." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1976.

Stake, Robert E., "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca: Peacock Publishers Inc., 1971.

Stodolsky, S.S. "Identifying and Evaluating Open Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 57, (October, 1975) 113-117.

Stufflebeam, D.L. "Toward A Science Of Educational Evaluation," Educational Technology, Vol. 8, (July, 1968) 5-12.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. and others. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca: Peacock Publishers Inc., 1971.

Thomas, Donald. "Who is an Effective Principal?," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 58, (September, 1974) 48-52.

Thomas, Donald. "The Principal and Teacher Evaluation," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, Vol. 58, (December, 1974) 3-5.

Toews, Robert J. "Expectations of Principals, Superintendents, and Teacher Sub-groups for the Role of the Elementary-junior High Principal." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Traugott, William Marion. "A Study of the Difference Between School Administrators' and Teachers' Perceptions of Administrators' Actual and Ideal Priorities of Responsibility." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Kansas State University, 1976.

Volk, Adolf John. "Teacher Evaluation in an Urban Saskatchewan School District." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Univerisity of Alberta, 1972.

Wichert, F.R., and D.E. McFarland. Measuring Executive Effectiveness. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

APPENDIX A

Letters to Respondents

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA
T6G 2G5

February 28, 1977

I am writing to request your participation in a research project. This project is under the direction of Professor A.G. Konrad and will satisfy one of the requirements for an M.Ed. degree in Educational Administration.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to determine perceptions of Alberta superintendents and principals regarding the evaluation of principals. All superintendents and a random sample of 100 principals have been requested to assist in identifying existing and perferred practices in Alberta. The findings of this study will improve our understanding of the evaluation of principals and may increase the effectiveness of school principals. Dr. E.J. Ingram, President of the Council on School Administration, has endorsed this project.

I would be most appreciative if you would complete the accompanying questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope before March 15, 1977. You will find that completing the questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes of your time.

The individual responses will be kept in strictest confidence. The data obtained will be presented only in the form of consolidated findings and no individual or school summaries will be developed. The questionnaires have been coded to permit me to mail follow-up reminders to increase the percentage of returns.

An abstract of the findings will be made available to those who make a request for one on the returned questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

Keith P. Sterling

KPS/hlp

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Department of Educational Administration
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T6G 2G5 TELEPHONE 432-5241

March 11, 1977

Recently you received a request to complete a questionnaire on principal evaluation that will be used in a research study that I have undertaken for my M.Ed. degree in Educational Administration.

In checking the responses to my survey, I do not find a reply from you. Your response is important to this study, and I would appreciate receiving your reply as soon as possible. If you have mislaid the original questionnaire, I will be glad to send you another on request. (Telephone 432-3651)

Should you have already returned your completed questionnaire, please ignore this request and accept my thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Keith P. Sterling

KPS/hlp

APPENDIX B

Principal Evaluation Questionnaire

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire Number:_____ | Punch cc 1-4

PART ONE: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA

Please circle the number of the appropriate response.

1. What was your age on January 1, 1977?

1. Under 26	4. 36 - 40	7. 51 - 55	
2. 26 - 30	5. 41 - 45	8. 56 - 60	___ 5
3. 31 - 35	6. 46 - 50	9. Over 60	

2. What is your sex?

1. Male	2. Female	___ 6

3. How many complete years of experience do you have as a full-time principal?

1. None	4. 11 - 15	
2. 1 - 5	5. 16 - 20	___ 7
3. 6 - 10	6. Over 20	

4. How many complete years of experience do you have as a full-time superintendent?

1. None	4. 11 - 15	
2. 1 - 5	5. 16 - 20	___ 8
3. 6 - 10	6. Over 20	

5. What is your present position?

1. Superintendent
2. Principal ___ 9

6. What is your highest attained level of formal education?

1. Less than Bachelor's degree.
2. Bachelor's degree(s) but less than Master's degree.
3. Master's degree. ___ 10
4. More than Master's degree.
5. Doctorate.

7. Are you employed by a school district located in Calgary or Edmonton?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ ___ 11

8. Principals please respond to the following:

a) Number of teachers on staff?

				cc
1. 10 or fewer	4. 31 - 40	7. 61 - 70	___	12
2. 11 - 20	5. 41 - 50	8. 71 - 80		
3. 21 - 30	6. 51 - 60	9. Over 80		

b) How is your school classified?

1. Elementary School
2. Elementary-Junior High School
3. Elementary-Junior-Senior High School
4. Junior High School
5. Junior-Senior High School
6. Senior High School
7. Other (Specify) _____

___ 13

PART TWO: EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATION CRITERIA

This section lists 36 criteria which may be taken into account in the evaluation of principals. You are asked to indicate your perception of the importance that each criterion is given in principal evaluation (EXISTING) and the importance each criterion should be given in principal evaluation (PREFERRED)

Please circle the appropriate letter in this section according to the following scale:

SD - STRONGLY DISAGREE that the statement is/should be important.
D - DISAGREE that the statement is/should be important.
A - AGREE that the statement is/should be important.
SA - STRONGLY AGREE that the statement is/should be important.

EXAMPLE:

Adheres to his promises. EXISTING SD (D) A SA
PREFERRED SD D A (SA)

This response indicates the respondent disagrees that this statement is given importance in principal evaluation, but strongly agrees that the statement should be given great importance in the evaluation of principals.

			cc
1. Capacity for contemplation of the future.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	14
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	15
2. Interprets school program to the community.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	16
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	17
3. Organizes human and material resources.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	18
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	19

			cc
4. Staff inspired to achieve goals.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	20
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	21
5. Reviews progress of students.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	22
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	23
6. Acceptability of personality.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	24
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	25
7. Decisions respected by staff.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	26
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	27
8. Personnel located in proper place at predetermined time.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	28
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	29
9. Delegated duties discharged by subordinates.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	30
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	31
10. Expertise in school management.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	32
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	33
11. Sets an example for staff to follow.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	34
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	35
12. Courage to take risks.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	36
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	37
13. Ability to stimulate.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	38
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	39
14. Establishes communication channels deliberately.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	40
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	41
15. Exactness in communication.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	42
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	43
16. Maintains liaison with other principals.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	44
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	45
17. Suitability of appearance.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	46
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	47
18. Establishes order of priority in problem solving.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	48
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	49
19. Capability for influencing.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	50
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	51
20. Regularly evaluates staff performance formally.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	52
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	53
21. Mastery of educational administration studies	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	54
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	55

				cc
22. Develops techniques to overcome organizational resistance to change.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	56
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	57
23. Staff knowledgeable of school policy.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	58
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	59
24. Budget funds expended according to plan.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	60
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	61
25. Skill for organizing.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	62
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	63
26. School operated successfully.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	64
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	65
27. Training in decision making.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	66
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	67
28. Develops budget control systems.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	68
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	69
29. Involves staff in policy formation.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	70
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	71
30. Students' performance recognized.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	72
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	73
31. School buildings and grounds maintained.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	74
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	75
32. Balance attained between innovative and proven programs.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	76
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	77
33. Community well informed of school programs.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	78
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	79
			___2	1-4
34. Sensitive to when change is necessary.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	5
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	6
35. Routine matters disposed of effectively.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	7
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	8
36. Develops efficient methods for handling school routine.	EXISTING	SD D A SA	___	9
	PREFERRED	SD D A SA	___	10

PART THREE: EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATORS

This section lists nine possible evaluators that may be used in the formal evaluation of principals. You are asked to indicate your perception of the extent to which each evaluator <u>is</u> <u>involved</u> in principal evaluation (EXISTING) and the extent to which each evaluator <u>should</u> <u>be</u> <u>involved</u> in principal evaluation (PREFERRED).

Please respond to the EXISTING and PREFERRED involvement of each evaluator by circling the appropriate letter according to the following scale:

SD - STRONGLY DISAGREE that this evaluator is/should be involved in principal evaluation.
D - DISAGREE that this evaluator is/should be involved in principal evaluation.
A - AGREE that this evaluator is/should be involved in principal evaluation.
SA - STRONGLY AGREE that this evaluator is/should be involved in principal evaluation.

			cc
1. Superintendent.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	11
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	12
2. Superintendent's designate.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	13
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	14
3. The principal alone.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	15
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	16
4. The teaching staff of the school.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	17
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	18
5. The students of the school.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	19
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	20
6. An assessment team consisting of an administrator and an experienced teacher from another school within the system.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	21
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	22
7. An assessment team consisting of the superintendent, principal and a third person acceptable to both.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	23
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	24
8. An assessment team of professional educators and lay members of the school community.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	25
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	26
9. An assessment team of professional educators outside the school system. (e.g. Regional Office staff)	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	27
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	28

PART FOUR: EXISTING AND PREFERRED PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

This section lists four possible purposes for the evaluation of principals. You are asked to indicate your perception of the extent to which principals are evaluated and the extent principals should be evaluated for each of the indicated purposes.

Please respond to each purpose, EXISTING and PREFERRED, by circling the appropriate letter according to the following scale:

SD - STRONGLY DISAGREE that this is/should be a purpose for evaluation.
D - DISAGREE that this is/should be a purpose for evaluation.
A - AGREE that this is/should be a purpose for evaluation.
SA - STRONGLY AGREE that this is/should be a purpose for evaluation.

			cc
1. Evaluation should be an instrument for measuring personal success.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	29
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	30
2. Evaluation should form the basis of disciplinary measures. (e.g. reduction of salary, removal from service, etc.)	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	31
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	32
3. All evaluation data should be used for improvement of administrative performance.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	33
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	34
4. Principals should be evaluated for appraisal for promotion to an open position.	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	35
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	36
5. Other. (Please specify)			
_____	EXISTING SD D A SA	___	37
	PREFERRED SD D A SA	___	38

Do you wish to receive a copy of the abstract of the findings?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

Thank you for your co-operation.

Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible in the self-addressed envelope or to:

Mr. Keith P. Sterling,
102 Spatinow Drive,
Wetaskiwin, Alberta.
T9A 1W2